

Lieut. (Junior Grade) Harry H. Caldwell, to be a lieutenant in the Navy from the 29th day of December, 1899, vice Lieut. William F. Fullam, promoted.

Lieut. Commander Uriah R. Harris, to be a commander in the Navy from the 31st day of December, 1899, vice Commander James W. Carlin, deceased.

Medical Inspector William G. Farwell, to be a medical director in the Navy from the 22d day of January, 1900, vice Medical Director Grove S. Beardsley, retired.

Surg. Daniel N. Bertolette, to be a medical inspector in the Navy from the 22d day of January, 1900, vice Medical Inspector William G. Farwell, promoted.

Pay Inspector Daniel A. Smith, to be a pay director in the Navy from the 20th day of January, 1900, vice Pay Director Edwin May, retired.

Rev. L. Paul Rennolds, a citizen of Maryland, to be a chaplain in the Navy from the 31st day of January, 1900, to fill a vacancy existing in that corps.

#### WITHDRAWAL.

*Executive nomination withdrawn February 5, 1900.*

Louis A. Knackstedt, of Colorado, who was appointed during the recess of the Senate, to be agent for the Indians of the Southern Ute Agency in Colorado.

#### CONFIRMATIONS.

*Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 5, 1900.*

##### POSTMASTERS.

Leander W. Dutro, to be postmaster at Memphis, in the county of Shelby and State of Tennessee.

Richard M. Norment, to be postmaster at Lumberton, in the county of Robeson and State of North Carolina.

Robert P. Caldwell, to be postmaster at Newton, in the county of Catawba and State of North Carolina.

Millard F. Kepner, to be postmaster at New Rockford, in the county of Eddy and State of North Dakota.

George B. Tretbar, to be postmaster at Lamberton, in the county of Redwood and State of Minnesota.

Jesse A. Maxwell, to be postmaster at Fulda, in the county of Murray and State of Minnesota.

Leonard S. Calkins, to be postmaster at Nevada City, in the county of Nevada and State of California.

Moses C. Thomas, to be postmaster at Homer, in the county of Champaign and State of Illinois.

William H. Holt, to be postmaster at Graham, in the county of Alamance and State of North Carolina.

John H. Crowder, to be postmaster at Gordon, in the county of Sheridan and State of Nebraska.

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, February 5, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

##### LEAVE TO PRINT IN THE RECORD.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th of last month I submitted some remarks, pending the appropriation bill, on the Gage resolution. I have been engaged since that time trying cases in my State, and did not submit the remarks—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend until the House is in order. It is impossible for the Chair to hear what is being said. Gentlemen will cease conversation and resume their seats. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DALY].

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on the 19th day of January I submitted some remarks to the House on the Gage resolution, and held the same for revision and extension in the RECORD. Immediately thereafter I was called home to try some causes and was absent until the latter part of last week and failed to submit the remarks within the time limited under the rule. I now ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD these remarks. I ask for five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks upon the Gage resolution, having failed to do so within the time limited. He asks for five days' time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the order is made.

##### JOHN ANDERSON.

Mr. FLYNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 6493) for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children.

The bill was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a fee simple patent to John Anderson and the following adult children of said John Anderson, to wit, Julia Anderson, John Anderson, jr., Thomas Anderson, Eliza Anderson, and Maggie Anderson, to all the land now held by them and purchased from the United States under the act of May 23, 1872, and located in Pottawatomie County, Oklahoma Territory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. I hope that we shall have some statement, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FLYNN. I ask that the report be read.

The report (by Mr. FLYNN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6493) for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children, beg leave to report that they have had the same under consideration and report that the bill do pass, and attach as part hereof the correspondence had with the Interior Department concerning said bill.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
Washington, January 26, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 17th instant, requesting report on the accompanying H. R. 6493, "A bill for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children."

This bill provides for the issuance of a fee-simple patent to John Anderson and his five children to all the land now held by them and purchased from the United States under the act of May 23, 1872, and located in Pottawatomie County, Okla.

In response thereto I transmit herewith a copy of a report, dated the 24th instant, from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, in which recommendation is made for the passage of the bill.

The Commissioner's recommendation meets with my approval.

Very respectfully,

E. A. HITCHCOCK, Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
House of Representatives.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,  
Washington, January 24, 1900.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt, by your reference, for consideration, report, and recommendation, of a letter from Hon. J. S. SHERMAN, dated January 17, 1900, submitting House bill No. 6493, entitled "A bill for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children."

In reply I have to state that the said John Anderson is a bright, intelligent man, of fine business qualifications, upon whom this office largely depends for information as to members of the tribe, their identity, and, in case of deceased Pottawatomies, who are their sole heirs and how they became such—important data required of a business committee of six members of the Pottawatomie tribe in the consideration of deeds of conveyance of land in Oklahoma Territory by the several allottees of the Pottawatomie Nation under act of Congress approved August 15, 1894.

Mr. Anderson and his children took their allotments under the act of May 23, 1872 (17 Stats., 159), which required payment therefor and only permitted the issuance of certificates by this office as evidence of title in and to said lands, and their sale was restricted to persons of Indian blood residing within the then Indian Territory, with the approval of the President. If any Indian, by reason of his intelligence and frugality, is deserving of a patent in fee for his land, surely John Anderson is. I take great pleasure in recommending the passage of this bill.

I return herewith said bill and submit a copy of this report.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

W. A. JONES, Commissioner.

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SHATTUC, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

##### REPRINT OF A BILL.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for a reprint of 500 copies of House bill No. 15, introduced by Mr. BROSIUS, providing for a retirement fund for clerks. The supply is exhausted, and there is much demand for it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET] asks unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill No. 15 of 500 copies—

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request for 500 copies and let it stand simply for a reprint.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for a reprint of House bill No. 15. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

##### POLLUTION OF WATER SUPPLY.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the rules of the House be suspended for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5) to appoint a commission for the investigation of the pollution of water supplies where such pollution affects or threatens to affect the sanitary condition of the people of more than one State.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.* That a scientific commission shall be appointed to investigate fully the subject of the pollution of rivers and other natural sources of water supply where the sanitary condition of the people of more than one State is affected or threatened to be affected by such pollution, this commission to consist of five members, to be appointed by the President, by and

with the consent of the Senate, whose compensation during the time when actually engaged in the performance of their duties under this act shall be \$10 per diem each and reasonable expenses.

SEC. 2. That the commission shall meet in Washington, D. C., within thirty days after the passage of this act, to consider the methods to be adopted in the investigation, and it shall have authority and be empowered to make use of the services of chemical, bacteriological, and sanitary experts, and of such persons as it may judge most competent by reason of their special knowledge and experience to afford it correct information on the subject of its inquiry, as well in formulating its methods as in carrying them into effect. It shall meet thereafter from time to time at such places as it may consider best suited for the furtherance of its inquiry.

SEC. 3. That the commission shall report to Congress at its next session the progress made in the investigation undertaken under this act, and shall submit such suggestions as may seem desirable, with the view of remedying any insanitary conditions that have been developed by its work.

SEC. 4. That the sum of \$30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to pay the salaries and expenses of said commission and carry out the purposes of this act.

With the following amendments recommended by the committee:

In line 3, page 1, insert, after "a" and before "commission," the word "scientific."

In line 7, page 1, strike out "three" and insert "five."

In line 11, page 1, strike out the words "\$10 per diem" and insert in lieu thereof the words "at the rate of \$5,000 per annum."

In lines 2 and 3, page 2, strike out the words "passage of this act" and insert in lieu thereof the words "date of its appointment."

In line 13, page 2, insert, after "report" and before "to," the word "finally."

In line 14, page 2, strike out "progress made in" and insert in lieu thereof the words "results of."

In line 16, page 2, strike out "insanitary" and insert in lieu thereof the word "unsanitary."

In line 18, page 2, strike out the word "thirty" and insert in lieu thereof the word "forty."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. HOPKINS. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, that I am opposed to this bill, but I demand a second.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Missouri has twenty minutes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill unanimously recommended by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. It provides for an investigation of the pollution of water supplies. The investigation is to be conducted by a nonpartisan scientific commission to be appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate. This, together with a small appropriation, is all that is asked for in this measure. I believe there is no member on this floor who is not interested, from a due regard for the health and lives of his constituents, in the success of this legislation, and a mere statement of the object of the bill seems to me to be sufficient to commend it not only to the members of this House, but to all thoughtful and well-meaning citizens of this country.

In our country, as everyone knows, it is the universal practice to discharge the waste of manufacturing establishments and the filth and sewage of cities into the rivers. The question presented in this bill is whether this can longer be permitted to be done without injuriously affecting the health and lives of our people and whether, if the pollution is found to threaten life, it will not be advisable to stop this nefarious practice by legislation. We must remember that it is one of the inalienable rights of the people to have the water for drinking, for watering stock, for manufacturing, agricultural, and domestic uses come to them in its natural and accustomed flow, free from sewage and pollution; and since it is a notorious fact, known to everyone, that this right has not been properly protected, such protection becomes the legitimate object of legislation and a duty and necessity.

Right here, Mr. Speaker, I ask the Clerk to read an extract from consular reports which were made in the year 1895 in response to an inquiry of the State Department upon this very subject.

The Clerk read as follows:

The soil of many of our cities, saturated with the putrefying contents of cesspools and leaking sewers, emits at certain seasons the poisonous emanations which generate typhoid fever, yellow fever, diphtheria, dysentery, and cholera, while the waters of our principal rivers are too often converted into open sewers teeming with pestiferous exhalations. The government of every State, whose duty it should be to superintend and watch over the health of the community at large, would do wisely to lay down and carry out an efficient, complete, and common-sense plan of drainage and sewerage for every town and city of the commonwealth.

Were the fearful consequences which result from the reprehensible practice of converting our rivers into open sewers properly understood and properly estimated by the public, no expenditure of time or money would be deemed too great to put an end to a system so disgusting and so destructive to the health and lives of the community at large, but more especially of those whose avocations necessitate their daily and hourly exposure to the evil. Unless this suicidal practice is abated by penal enactment, our cities will ultimately become the hotbeds of pestilence and plagues, such as prevailed in the middle ages.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, the reports following these introductory remarks show that the large cities of nearly all civilized countries have long ago discontinued the barbarous practice of dumping filth and sewage into their running streams. Either the sewage is subjected to a process of purification before

it is so discharged, as in London, or it is utilized for irrigation purposes, as in Berlin and other cities. Is it not high time that this subject is taken up here? There is no difference of opinion among sanitary experts and physicians as to the supreme necessity of the case. They are all agreed that the high death rate of typhoid fever in nearly all our large cities is directly traceable to our primitive methods of sewage disposal, and especially to the pollution of our river water. For the present we are not asked to inquire into the methods of remedying the evil, but we are asked by the people and the press to provide for an investigation, an inquiry as to the extent and the nature of the evil; then Congress can make the official reports on this question the basis for further legislative action.

What are we doing? We have city boards of health and State boards of health, but what has been done for the protection of health nationally? By quarantine regulations, it is true, we have endeavored to protect our people against infection from outside, and our Marine-Hospital Service has been very efficient in this respect. But when it comes to the question of infection from within our borders, very little, if anything, has been done. It may be argued that under our system of government this is left to the several States, but how about cases where one State suffers from the practices of another State? Shall the District of Columbia make war upon Maryland because the people of that State are polluting the water of the Potomac? Shall the people of Ohio invade the State of Pennsylvania with an armed force to stop the people of Pittsburgh from discharging their factory waste and their sewage into the Ohio River? Shall Missouri read the riot act to the people of Chicago and Illinois because the nasty contents of the Chicago Drainage Canal, recently opened, are being emptied into the Mississippi? Ah, you say the Federal courts will provide a remedy in such cases. True, but this surely does not acquit us of our responsibility and duty. Legislation is had to prevent litigation by establishing certain general rules of conduct and by furnishing at the same time an authoritative measure according to which justice is meted out to all alike. Official reports of a Government commission will largely obviate the necessity of taking expert testimony in court and will be instrumental in each court proceeding in determining the facts. Every consideration of public welfare demands the speedy enactment of legislation of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I desire to add that this bill has been recommended by the legislatures as well as the State boards of health of a large number of States, and its passage has been strongly urged by the National Medical Association, an organization of physicians extending into every State of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri if he undertakes to claim that under the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States no remedy can be invoked by a State where such pollution exists as that to which he refers?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I have just stated, Mr. Speaker, that the remedy did exist to a certain extent in the Federal courts. But this does not acquit Congress of its duty and responsibility to the people of the country to protect them against this pollution.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But you are speaking now of the enactment of legislation for a commission to go all over the country and investigate the pollution of rivers without reference to the demand of the people of localities for protection in that regard.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Wherever the water is used for drinking purposes or agricultural purposes or domestic purposes this commission can be called upon to proceed to the locality indicated and make an investigation and make its report upon the subject.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But what about the conflict of jurisdiction between the United States and the States? You establish here at once a policy which necessarily leads to a conflict of jurisdiction on matter of State polity.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman is mistaken in that. That point has been already settled by the enactment of the national quarantine law.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But this is evidently an enlargement of the quarantine laws, although there is no question of any pollution affecting a whole section, such as the quarantine laws usually apply to.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the gentleman desires to occupy some time, I will yield to him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Not just now.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Then I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has nine minutes remaining.

Mr. RICHARDSON rose.

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I promised to yield to the senior gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. I now yield him five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a proposition to appoint a commission of five persons—a scientific commission—to investigate fully the subject of the pollution of rivers and other natural sources of water supply. The pay of these commissioners



is to be \$5,000 each, and the bill appropriates \$40,000. It is true the bill makes provision that a final report shall be made to the next Congress; but I think I may fairly prophesy that if this commission be organized its work will be extended for the next year, and the next year, and the next year, and for many years to come.

Now, if this be an important investigation, and if this be the best way to make it, well and good; then let us make it in this way. But, in my judgment, if this investigation should be made at all, there are better ways of making it. I know it is not worth while to talk about economy, and I will not talk of this question from that standpoint.

I repeat, that if there is no other way to do this important work as it ought to be done than by the appointment of a commission, then let us appoint a commission. But I think that if this work is necessary, there is a better way of doing it under existing law. We have a National Academy of Sciences which, for the bare payment of traveling expenses, has done better work on great questions than any or all of the commissions that have ever been appointed. We can under the law refer this matter to that eminent body—nonpartisan, patriotic, capable—and we shall get a prompt report.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman yield to me a moment?

Mr. CANNON. I have but five minutes. I will yield to the gentleman at the conclusion of my remarks if I have any time left.

That is one way to do this work—through the National Academy of Sciences. There is another way to do it. We have a Marine-Hospital Service engaged in investigating questions of this very kind. That body expends \$100,000, \$200,000, \$300,000, \$400,000 a year in the investigation of sanitary questions. Now, let me say, measuring my words, that I believe that this Marine-Hospital Service is more competent than a dozen commissions would be to do this work. If it is important to have this investigation and to arrive at the facts, the Marine-Hospital Service already has the material, the laboratories, etc., for doing this work. It is already doing work along the line of these investigations. Let us refer this matter to that body, if it is necessary to have an investigation, and we shall in that way get the facts.

Commissions, after they investigate, make reports, which are printed and which then sleep the long sleep of death. Nobody reads them. Why, sir, you can find about this Capitol reports of commissions by the cord which have been made during the last dozen years on subjects which most of us did not know were being investigated or reported upon.

Now, as I understand from the dispatches, there is a case pending that meets my friend's view. What moves him, I apprehend, is the question of sewage from Illinois that may reach Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

Mr. CANNON. I have but five minutes, and the gentleman must excuse me. I presume that is what moves him. Under the law and the Constitution, if the dispatches can be trusted, there is already pending in the court of last resort—the Supreme Court of the United States—this very question. They have got to take the evidence; they have got to try the case; they have got to settle this case of pollution of the national water courses and how the public health in the various States would be affected. And when they come with a judgment it will cover the whole ground. What is the use of vexing the atmosphere with this commission and that commission? If it is wise at all to make an investigation of this sort with this litigation pending, then let us, as I have suggested, utilize the National Academy of Sciences, which can do the work without expense ably and fairly, or, if you will not utilize the National Academy, let us utilize the Marine-Hospital Service.

Now, that is all I want to say; and if I have any time left I yield it to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT].

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Very well; I will take my own time.

Mr. CANNON. I had no wish to be discourteous. If the gentleman will yield to me a minute or two I will answer any question he may wish to put.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] for five minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS. If agreeable to the Chair, I will allow the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] to yield to my colleague, in order to answer his question.

Mr. CANNON. I did not intend to be discourteous, nor did I want to dodge any question.

Mr. RICHARDSON. It is understood that this does not come out of our time.

The SPEAKER. It comes out of the time of the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman from Illinois has stated that St. Louis is interested in this question. I say yes. If he wants to put the matter in that way, I am perfectly willing to admit that I speak for the people of St. Louis and for the protection of their health and their lives.

Mr. CANNON. Is not the matter being litigated now?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. If the gentleman wants to be put in a position of defending the claims of Chicago, I have no objection to his pursuing that course; but, if I am correct, a gentleman representing Chicago on this floor [Mr. MANN] is a member of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and he has no objection to this bill. The drainage commissioners in Chicago have unanimously passed a resolution advocating the passage of this bill, so that not only in St. Louis and in Chicago, but all over the country, we may have a fair examination by bacteriologists of the highest standing upon this very important question.

Mr. CANNON. I should like just a minute.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield a minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Now, let me say to my friend that I do not represent Chicago as against St. Louis, or St. Louis as against Chicago, two great, powerful cities; but I stand here as a Representative in Congress. I do not know what the drainage district wants, nor what the Representative from Cook County wants, but I say in the interest of the public service, in my judgment, no good result is to be had from the organization of this commission, and upon my own authority, independent of everybody else, I record my protest against it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] has five minutes.

Mr. HOPKINS. Mr. Speaker, the answer just made by the gentleman who introduced this bill to my colleague [Mr. CANNON] discloses the motive that prompts him to ask Congress to pass this bill, which is to practically appropriate \$40,000 for the benefit of the city of St. Louis and the State of Missouri.

Now, gentlemen will observe that the bill creates a commission composed of five members and gives each of these members a salary of \$5,000 per annum, thus absorbing, if they take a year, \$25,000 of the proposed \$40,000.

In addition to that they are allowed also their reasonable expenses, which, in my judgment, would more than double the amount of the salary, because no commission can investigate the rivers of this country for the pittance of \$15,000. They will be required to charter a vessel of some kind or character, to go up and down these various rivers, at a large expense to the General Government, so that when they come to make their report, instead of taking \$40,000 out of the Treasury of the United States, it will cost from one hundred to two hundred thousand dollars.

Is there any necessity for this, from a national standpoint? Every gentleman familiar with the legislation of our country and the powers and authorities delegated to these various bureaus and departments knows that the Marine-Hospital Service of the Government has absolute control and jurisdiction over this subject. The Marine-Hospital Service is to-day engaged in this very question that is embodied in this bill, and the Marine-Hospital Service, Mr. Speaker, can control revenue cutters, with which they can go into any of the rivers or bays or inlets at a less expense to the Government than would be incurred by this proposed commission, and their investigations are of a nonpartisan character and will be much more important to the general public and to Congress than any investigation that might be made by a commission of this kind.

Then we come back, Mr. Speaker, to this proposition: There being no reason from a national standpoint why an extra commission should be appointed and this extra expense incurred, is there any reason from a State standpoint? The States of this Union have absolute jurisdiction within their limits, and the cities within those States have jurisdiction likewise, and you will find that not only the States, but all the great cities have commissions appointed to look out for and protect the general public from the pollution of any of the rivers, inlets, or bays, and they have, as I say, plenary power within the limits of the State. Now, as between the city of St. Louis and the city of Chicago, is there any reason for this legislation? Why is this newborn zeal of my friend from the city of St. Louis, one of the Representatives from Missouri? He has been in Congress here, to my knowledge, six or eight years, an energetic, pushing, able Representative, but until recently he had never thought that there was any necessity for such legislation as this.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Just a moment, Mr. Speaker. I desire to say to my friend that this bill was introduced in the Fifty-third Congress by myself, long before anybody thought of the Chicago Drainage Canal ever becoming a danger to the city of St. Louis and its people.

Mr. HOPKINS. Well, I will say, Mr. Speaker, that that bill has been buried with the mass of proposed legislation that has never been brought to the attention of the House. To my knowledge, this is the first time in the history of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] that it has ever been pressed upon the attention of Congress in the manner now proposed.

Now, as has been said by my colleague [Mr. CANNON], there is on this question of drainage between the State of Illinois and the State of Missouri a case pending in the Supreme Court of the

United States. The State of Missouri has commenced a suit in the Supreme Court, under the provisions of the Constitution, to test this very question of the pollution of rivers, streams, etc., and the State of Illinois, in due time, will make response to that. That is the issue presented, and evidence will be taken in that lawsuit as to whether any of the rivers in Illinois or those in Missouri or that pass by or through it will be polluted by the action of the city of Chicago. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, if the members of this House propose to make an appropriation here for the State of Missouri to litigate a question against the State of Illinois. If Missouri is in that financial condition that the hat should be passed around, let it be done in a private manner and not come to the Treasury of the United States. [Laughter.]

The gentleman ought to know that if this evidence is taken it can not be used under the law at all; and I trust that the members—

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, one feature of this measure presents an evil that is growing in this country and which calls for prompt correction. It is a custom which has become general of appointing commissioners to consider legislative subjects, to voice the wish of Administrations and not the wish of the people, to control the sentiments of the people and not to echo them. Numerous commissions in late years have been appointed, not to protect the voter, but to formulate policies for an Administration. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says that the reports of the commissioners are useless, as a rule, and are usually buried without reading.

This is a strong argument for economy and against the creation of commissions. But I differ from the gentleman as to many of these commissions, and we find many of their reports brought in and presented to this House, and their superior opportunity for investigating the facts is urged as a reason why we should follow their recommendations. But, sir, they do not represent our constituencies, and every time you authorize a commission to consider legislative subjects you are abdicating your rights as sovereign representatives of the people, not to mention the great expense with which you are burdening them by such creations, and not to mention other evils ensuing.

I have known men with principles firm set and intolerant to be mellowed and won over by the glitter of a commission. Scores of commissions are being appointed, and so far members here are relinquishing their sovereignty and the rights and interest of their constituents. I protest against it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. PEARRE. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with a favorable report from the committee, and I desire to say in the very limited time allotted to me that I heartily favor this provision; and more, the additional provisions which I favor are embodied in a bill which I offered to this House early in the present session. This provision adds to the provisions of this bill penalties for the pollution of streams which are the source of water supply to the people of the various cities and towns of the United States. While I favor this bill, I think it incomplete in that it does not define the crime and furnish a penalty for the violation of the law. However, I desire to add my voice to that of the gentleman from Missouri in advocacy of this measure. It has been suggested here by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] that the zeal of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BARTHOLDT] is new born.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the zeal may be new born; but it is better that the gentleman from Missouri should be inspired by a new-born zeal to perform a long-neglected public duty than that he should smother in the womb of an unfulfilled duty the zeal which should characterize members upon this floor in regard to the provisions of this bill. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which is urging the consideration of the people of the United States. The various rivers of the United States have been investigated, and principally among them the Potomac River, on the banks of which I live, and which furnishes the water supply to the District of Columbia, the seat of the National Government. It has already been determined, I will say to my valued friend from Illinois, that the Potomac River is polluted, and that has been determined by the Marine-Hospital Service. It has also been determined—

Mr. HOPKINS. Will the gentleman allow me right there to interrupt him?

Mr. PEARRE. Certainly.

Mr. HOPKINS. If it is true that that work has been done by the Marine-Hospital Service, you can not do anything more than that by this bill.

Mr. PEARRE. I favor additional provisions, and I think that this bill is a step in the right direction.

Mr. HOPKINS. This will not do anything that can not be done by the Marine-Hospital Service.

Mr. PEARRE. I will say in reply to the gentleman that this bill provides for a recommendation of remedial legislation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I will yield three minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. DALY].

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentleman from Missouri, let me say to him that if he will consult the laws of New Jersey for the last two years he will find this subject-matter considered; and if he will consult the law reports of New Jersey for the last year he will find that the citizens of New Jersey have enjoined the city of Paterson from dumping its sewage into the waters of the river Passaic, and the entire matter is covered in the decisions, as well as by legislation.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Certainly.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Does not that relate to a stream altogether within the boundary lines of your State?

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. Yes; but that does not prevent the circuit court of the United States from taking jurisdiction as between two States.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. But this entirely relates to a case where the health of the people of more than one State is affected.

Mr. DALY of New Jersey. If the citizens of Illinois and the citizens of Missouri are injured, or vice versa, one citizen can restrain the other by injunction from the circuit court of the United States the same as a State court would enjoin its own private citizens. There is a complete remedy at law without appealing to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, how much time is left in opposition to the bill?

The SPEAKER. Six minutes remain under the control of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman from Missouri wish to occupy any time now?

Mr. BARTHOLDT. No.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I only want to say a word—

Mr. BARTHOLDT. I beg the gentleman's pardon; I did not understand him. If he desires to yield me his six minutes, I desire to accept. There are several gentlemen who have asked me for time to speak in favor of the bill.

Mr. RICHARDSON. No; I want to say a word in opposition to the measure. So far as I am concerned, I am not opposed to the investigation of the pollution of the water of any stream. I have no objection to the investigation being conducted by the Government experts under the direction of the Government; but I submit that we already have sufficient machinery to enable us to make this investigation. We have a number of bureaus that have been referred to by gentlemen who have spoken against the measure, and I am of opinion that they are not overcrowded with work. They have experts, and we are paying them annual salaries and carrying them on the pay roll.

Let us give them something to do. I am opposed to creating a commission of five additional experts now and giving the President of the United States the power to appoint them, to be sent out at all times, and perhaps to be carried along permanently. We have the Bureau for the Promotion of American Science, the Marine Bureau; we have experts in the Agricultural Department and in the bureaus of that great Executive Department of the Government, and they can make all this investigation and report to Congress. And then, as stated by the gentleman from New Jersey, the courts already, in my judgment, have ample jurisdiction to take care of this question. I am opposed to creating a commission of five additional experts with the large salaries mentioned. So far as I am concerned, I am content to have a vote taken on the measure. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Speaker, I merely desire to say, in answer to the gentleman from Tennessee, that this question of intrusting the Marine-Hospital Service with this work has been thoroughly gone over by the committee. In order to elevate this investigation beyond the possibility of sectional prejudice it was deemed wise to have an impartial nonpartisan commission appointed by the President of the United States, without regard to geographical lines and the sections of the country which are interested in this legislation. It is a well-known fact that the superintendent of the Marine-Hospital Service is a St. Louis gentleman, and while he is an excellent official, we want neither a St. Louis gentleman nor a gentleman from Chicago to be intrusted with this work; and in this instance a gentleman from Chicago happens to be Secretary of the Treasury. We want an impartial, independent commission, free from all sectional preferences and clothed with the highest national authority, a commission which will inspire the confidence so essential to the success of this legislation, and which can come into the House and say to us, "Here are the



facts as we have found them; they are absolutely true and reliable, and now base your further action and future legislation on our report."

Mr. TERRY. Why not let the Interstate Commerce Committee of the House investigate it?

Mr. BARTHOLOTT. I now yield three minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN].

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not an attack on the city of Chicago, as these overzealous gentlemen from Illinois seem to imagine. They say that they have no feeling of that kind, and yet I undertake to say that all the opposition inspired against this measure comes from the city of Chicago. They think in some way that it is an attack on their new drainage system. It is not true. The purpose of this bill is much broader than that. There is a dispute among scientists as to whether or no streams once polluted do speedily purify themselves, and it was to ascertain the very facts with regard to so important a matter as that that this bill found favor with the committee. This is not a new question, but it is one constantly growing in importance. As our cities become more and more populous, as they have drainage systems pouring into the depressions, all of them pouring into the drainage at the head of the streams and along the banks of the streams from which great multitudes of people draw all their drinking water, it is a matter of supreme importance that we should know what the actual facts are.

Some gentlemen say that in a distance of 400 miles, as the current flows in the Mississippi River, the water is purified. Others say in a distance of 15 miles this purification occurs. Now, there is a great range for dispute, and we want to know the actual facts. A little while ago a court found that the waters of the Potomac River north of us, or west of us, was not polluted, and failed to give relief; and yet every man who has passed along the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad has noticed the condition of the Potomac River for a distance of more than 30 miles below the city of Cumberland. I want to know, for one—I think other members of the House want to know—whether or not there is danger from this source. The gentleman from Illinois suggests that we have abundant means, and yet in one hundred years these means have not been invoked. It is necessary that some power should put them in motion. The society to which he refers has not yet undertaken the work which he says they are so well qualified to perform.

The power that might control, perhaps, has not done it, except in the case of the Potomac River, and there, according to my recollection, there was special authority given by Congress.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RICHARDSON. I yield one minute to the gentleman from St. Louis [Mr. JOY], although I believe that he is on the opposite side of the question from myself.

Mr. JOY. Mr. Speaker, by the courtesy of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] I want to say one word in behalf of this measure. It is not one in which St. Louis is arrayed against Chicago. I had charge of this bill in the Committee on Commerce, and every member of that committee—from the North and the South, from the Republican side and the Democratic side, from St. Louis and from Chicago—joined me in advocating the measure and requesting that it pass. Representing in that committee the city of Chicago was a gentleman from that city [Mr. MANN], who seconded the motion that the bill be reported with a favorable recommendation.

This is a bill providing for a high scientific commission to pass upon these questions—not in the interest of St. Louis as against Chicago, nor in any other interest but that the people of the United States and especially that the people of my city shall be convinced, as I believe they will be, that this influx of sewage from Chicago through the Illinois River would not injure the health of the people of the great city of St. Louis.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. BARTHOLOTT to suspend the rules and pass the bill, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 66, noes 87.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. WHITE. I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. I ask the Clerk to read the marked article which I send to the desk.

Mr. CUMMINGS. From what paper?

Mr. WHITE. From the News and Observer, published at Raleigh, N. C.

The Clerk read as follows:

#### THE COLORED MEMBER.

It is bad enough that North Carolina should have the only nigger Congressman. It is sufficiently humiliating to the white people of the Second district; a sad enough commentary upon the political conditions that have obtained in this State. What shall be said when that nigger Congressman gives utterance to the following on the floor of the House?—

"I have investigated the lynchings in the South and find that less than 15 per cent of them are due to the crime of rape. And I desire to announce here that if it were not for the assaults of white men upon black women, there would be less of the other class."

Thus does the Manleyism of 1898 show its head in 1900. Manley slandered white women in a scurrilous negro newspaper having a local circulation; WHITE justifies assaults by negroes on white women by slandering white men in a speech in the Congress of the United States. We are told that "the public galleries contained many colored people who applauded this utterance vigorously."

So far as this particular negro is personally concerned, he may be dismissed as beneath contempt. There is a far graver side to the matter. This negro is regarded by his race as a leader; he both reflects the sentiment of his race, and his utterances react upon his followers with an effect that was made sufficiently plain by the "vigorous applause" with which his slander was greeted by the negroes in the gallery. As the blatant mouthing of a mere negro, WHITE's utterances are not worth notice; as a fresh manifestation of negrophobia, of what the negro's attitude is toward the white man, now and always, its significance should not be allowed to escape us.

When a negro of some education and of more than ordinary intelligence among his race can so far forget himself as to use such language in a speech on the floor of Congress, what is to be expected of the more ignorant of his followers? If there were no other reason, this utterance of WHITE's is sufficient to show the absolute necessity of permanent white rule in this State. It makes plain the fact that the negro has learned nothing from experience, and that he is utterly devoid of all sense of official responsibility and of public decency—nay, more, that the negro in office regards himself as the enemy of the white man and is anxious to have his race share in that sentiment. Therefore he becomes a menace to the peace of the Commonwealth and a danger to the safety of both races.

The "inoffensive negro official" is largely a myth. The negro may be inoffensive as a private citizen, but with his induction into office he becomes a new individual. WHITE is typical of his kind. Venomous, forward, slanderous of the whites, appealing to the worst passions of his own race, he emphasizes anew the need of making an end of him and his kind. That is what the white people of this State propose to do. They have had enough of Manleyism. They have more than enough of Negro Congressman WHITE. He must be made an impossibility for the future, and will be. The people of this State will not tolerate that sort of thing. This has been made sufficiently plain already. And after next August it will be so plain that even WHITE, PRITCHARD, BUTLER, and all advocates of Manleyism will be able to understand it.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to give that vile, slanderous publication the widest possible circulation. I desire that it shall go out through the documents of this House that the world may see what the poor colored man in the Southland has to undergo from a certain class.

In making this statement it is proper, Mr. Speaker, that I should exonerate a very large percentage of the white people of North Carolina, my native State. No better people live anywhere on God's green earth than some of them. But, unfortunately, men of the type of him who wrote that article are now in the ascendancy.

I desire to repudiate as slanderous and wholly untrue the utterances there attributed to me. I did the other day, while my colleague [Mr. LINNEY] was speaking, interject a remark to the effect that from an investigation which I made last summer, as stated in a paper which I read before a local organization of this city, I had found that less than 15 per cent of the lynchings in this country were for assaults committed upon women, not in the South, but in the entire United States. I repeat that utterance. I did not justify the commission of assaults by black men upon white women on the ground that white men did the same in regard to black women.

I said that there were assaults occasionally committed upon women and that they were not all committed by black men upon white women, but were also committed by white men upon black women, as evidenced by the great numbers of mulattoes in the Southland. I said that then; I repeat it now; and if any man here or elsewhere desires to verify the truthfulness of that statement, he has but to make a visit through the South, where I live.

I repudiate as much as any man can anyone, whether he be a white brute or a black brute, who commits an assault upon any woman, whether a white woman or a black woman. I think such a man ought to be hung—hung by the neck until dead. But it ought to be done by the courts, not by an infuriated mob such as the writer of that article would incite.

Mr. Speaker, this article is but an evidence of what we have got to contend with—an absolute perversion and slanderous misrepresentation of the truth—preparing for the election to be held in August. And the world is notified that those whom the Constitution of these United States, by the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, has enfranchised are to be reduced once more to the condition of goods and chattels, if such men as the one who edits the News and Observer can have the control of affairs in North Carolina.

As I said before, I want to give the fullest publication to the utterances of this vile sheet; and I want my colleagues in this House, both Democrats and Republicans, with Populists thrown in, to judge my character and my conduct for the last three years on this floor and say whether or not it has conformed to the description given by this fellow who edits the News and Observer and pollutes the country with such literature as has been read at the desk. [Applause.]

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Pending that motion, I would like to have an opportunity to ask unanimous consent to occupy ten

minutes. The body of Major-General Lawton to-day lies in my home town—his home—and I would like an opportunity to offer a few remarks on that subject.

Mr. HITT. I will withdraw my motion in order to give the gentleman an opportunity to ask consent.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I ask unanimous consent to occupy ten minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that ten minutes be accorded him to make some remarks upon the life and character of General Lawton. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Indiana will proceed.

MAJ. GEN. HENRY W. LAWTON.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, while I speak these words of tribute here the body of General Lawton lies in state at his town and mine, Fort Wayne, in northern Indiana, surrounded by his comrades of the Thirtieth Indiana and by friends and associates of many years.

Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton's name will remain in the archives of the nation to commemorate his heroism and his fidelity as a soldier.

He needs no encomium to preserve his fame save the plain, blunt facts of his service in the field.

His life from early boyhood when he enlisted at 18 at Fort Wayne till he laid it down on the field of battle was a career of activity which fulfilled every requirement of a patriotic soldier.

He won his spurs and places of honor in the Army by active service in the field, and never enjoyed the advantage and distinction that come to the college trained.

He was a true type of that strong class commonly known as citizen soldiers, the volunteers. His prowess as a warrior was tested and proven in every mode of warfare. In the civil war, from 1861 to 1865, against foemen worthy of his steel, his own race, in wars with the Indians in the West, later with the Spanish, and last in the war in the Philippines, he showed all the elements of a soldier. In private life he was modest and unassuming. General Lawton's nearly forty years' service in the Army, his long service and activity, make him one of the most deserving heroes of our country.

All Indians recommended him for a brigadier-generalship in the Regular Army; he had won it, and the President and Senate were about to confer this distinguished honor upon him. This distinction so prized by a commander never reached General Lawton, but his name and fame will survive as if he had received it.

The generosity of individual citizens as shown to his widow voice the esteem in which he is held by them, but the Government which he served so long and well should likewise be generous to her.

Gen. Henry W. Lawton was a born fighter. Without the advantage of an education at the National Military Academy, so essential to recognition and promotion under the Army regulations, he secured a distinction that is rare in the records of our soldiers. These obstructions were overcome by severe hardships, by sore trials of endurance, by great activity, and by intrepidity in four wars. He doubtless saw the longest term of actual field service of any commander in the late history of our country.

He was repeatedly commended in general orders for "vigilance and zeal, rapidity and persistence of pursuit, great skill, perseverance and gallantry," and was awarded a medal of honor for distinguished gallantry in the war.

General Lawton was born in Ohio, March 17, 1843, but with his father moved to Fort Wayne, Ind., in 1858. A more complete summary of the interesting events of his life is presented in a letter which was read on September 19, 1899, at the reunion of his regiment, the Thirtieth Indiana, held at Millersburg, Ind., which letter reads:

HEADQUARTERS FIRST DIVISION EIGHTH ARMY CORPS,  
Manila, P. I., August 8, 1899.

MY DEAR COMRADE: Your favor of June 18 has just been received, and I hasten to assure you of my sincere appreciation of the kind feeling which you express for me from yourself as well as from the comrades you represent. If it has been my good fortune, in my efforts to perform my whole duty since the commencement of our war with Spain, to earn the good opinion and admiration of my friends and comrades of the civil war, it is a sufficient and ample recompense for all the effort it has cost me. There are no people in the world who can better judge of the merits of a soldier than those who fought from 1861 to 1865, and none whose good opinion I appreciate more highly.

Concerning the proposition which you refer to—to raise money for the purpose of making some substantial expression of your appreciation of my work—I beg to assure you that your good opinion and good wishes are all that I desire, and I trust that my friends will not burden themselves further. At the same time I beg to assure you of my heartfelt appreciation of your efforts in that direction.

In reply to your inquiries concerning my birthplace, residence, early life, etc., the following, I think, will cover all the facts you desire to know:

My father resided in Fort Wayne, Ind., long before I was born, he having come to Indiana at the time of the building of the Wabash and Erie Canal. I was born, however, on the 17th day of March, 1843, at Manhattan, in the State of Ohio. Manhattan, now a suburb of Toledo, is the point near which the canal entered Lake Erie. Later my parents resided in Mauree City, Ohio, and it is there my first recollections began. I attended the primary schools at that place, and at the age of 7 years my father went to California, and I, with my mother, moved to Lorain County, Ohio; two years later, my father having returned from California, I went with him to the

West, remaining something more than a year in Iowa and about one year in Missouri.

In 1858 my father returned to Fort Wayne, and I entered the Fort Wayne Methodist Episcopal College as a student. Since that time Fort Wayne has been my home. I remained at college until the breaking out of the war in April, 1861, when I enlisted in a company organized by Capt. W. P. Segur, which became part of the Ninth Indiana Volunteers. At the close of my term of service in that regiment I returned to Fort Wayne and immediately reenlisted with Capt. O. D. Hurd, whose company became part of the Thirtieth Indiana Volunteers. At the close of the war I returned to Fort Wayne as colonel of that regiment, entered the office of Judge Ninde (Ninde & Taylor) to read law. In the summer of 1866, at the solicitation of Judge Ninde, I left his office to take a law course at Harvard University, at Cambridge, Mass. I was a student at that institution when I received an appointment in the Regular Army, which I accepted.

As I was appointed to the Army from the State of Indiana, and as I was at the time a citizen and resident of Fort Wayne, my military service should not affect my residence or citizenship, and I still remain a resident of Fort Wayne and a citizen of that State. I have a letter before me from G. W. Boeger, secretary of Harmony Lodge, No. 19, I. O. O. F., dated Fort Wayne, Ind., February 24, 1899, in which the following occurs:

"I have a book before me in which you signed the constitution on the night of your initiation, and it reads, 'H. W. Lawton: residence, Fort Wayne, Ind.; age, 21; occupation, soldier; date, March 24, 1864.' This makes you the oldest living member," etc.

So, you will observe, I was a citizen of Fort Wayne at the time of reaching my majority. The Army Register shows me as appointed from Indiana, and there is on file in the Adjutant-General's Office various statements made by myself at different times, whenever my grade in the Army had to be changed, each of which reads, "Residence, Fort Wayne, Ind." I am also, as you know, a member of Sion S. Bass Post, G. A. R., and I am also a member of Summit City Lodge, F. and A. M., having joined that fraternity, I believe, the same year that I joined Harmony Lodge of Odd Fellows, to wit, 1864.

I have never wavered in my allegiance to the State of Indiana and have never for a moment contemplated a change of residence. Fort Wayne, Ind., is the only place where I could legally cast a vote or where I could have voted at any time since I attained my majority.

I was married to Mary Craig, near Louisville, Ky., in 1881; we have four children, one boy and three girls, all in good health and doing finely. I think you will find my name in a book giving a history of Allen County. I think this gives you all the information you desire and answers all your questions.

I take great interest in the reunions of our old regiments and keep posted as well as I can concerning my old comrades. I have, therefore, heard of the death of many of them, and feel often that the time is close at hand when I, too, must join the great majority as they go marching along.

Sincerely and fraternally, yours,

H. W. LAWTON.

Major-General, United States Volunteers.

A. S. COVELL, Fort Wayne, Ind.

Those who knew him at Fort Wayne in his boyhood spoke of his great interest and enthusiasm in all things military, and which presaged his future success in his chosen walk of life.

On the 18th of April, 1861, three days after President Lincoln's first call for volunteers in the war for the Union, at the age of 18, he enlisted as a private in the Ninth Indiana Volunteers.

He was discharged July 29, 1861. On September 24, 1861, he became first lieutenant of the Thirtieth Indiana Volunteers. He was made a captain May 17, 1862. February 10, 1865, he was made a lieutenant-colonel. He was brevetted colonel of volunteers March 13, 1865. He served with his regiment in the field in the Army of the Tennessee throughout that war, and at its close was mustered out, at the age of 22, as lieutenant-colonel, after being brevetted colonel for gallant and meritorious service and awarded a medal of honor for distinguished gallantry.

He was mustered out of the Volunteer Army November 25, 1865. He was commissioned second lieutenant in the Regular Army on the 28th of July, 1866, and served in the infantry until 1869, then in the cavalry until 1888, and thereafter as inspector-general until the commencement of the war with Spain.

Upon the declaration of war with Spain he was made brigadier-general of volunteers, and on the 8th of July following major-general of volunteers. His nomination for brigadier-general of the Regular Army was determined upon and was ready to be sent to the Senate upon the day of his death. He commanded the Second Division of the Fifth Army Corps in the Cuban campaign, rendering distinguished service in the battles before Santiago, and subsequently commanded the Department of Santiago and the Fourth Army Corps. On the 18th of March, 1899, he assumed command of the First Division of the Eighth Army Corps in the Philippine Islands and remained in command of this division in a practically continuous and most eventful service till he fell in battle on the 18th of December, 1899. He was a member of several Fort Wayne lodges—of Sion S. Bass Post, Grand Army of the Republic; of Harmony Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, No. 19, which conferred upon him a short time before his death a medal of honor as a quarter-of-a-century member; and of Summit City Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons.

The nation which he served so long mourns the death of this distinguished soldier, and Indians feel it as a personal loss. Fort Wayne, the place of his first enlistment, and the city which during his entire military service he cherished as his home, sincerely mourns his loss, and its citizens met together in a convention of sorrow in December, 1899, with many of his old soldier friends and brothers in affiliated orders, and voiced their sentiments in appropriate resolutions.

As a member of his lodge, as a son of one who fought with him in the Thirtieth Indiana, as a member of the American Congress, I esteem it a special privilege and honor that the Speaker and the



members here assembled turned from important public work to hear this tribute to Indiana's hero.

No truer sentiment can be spoken of General Lawton, no better tribute can be paid him, than to say he lived and died in the esteem of all his countrymen. The hearts of the volunteers were ever with him in his struggle up the obstructed stream of promotion in the Army, made difficult by his not receiving a military college education. He was their idol, and his heart was ever with the volunteers till it ceased to beat on the field of battle. No man was ever more popular with the volunteer soldiers than Maj. Gen. Henry W. Lawton. [Applause.]

CONTESTED ELECTION—EVANS VS. TURNER, FIFTH DISTRICT, KENTUCKY.

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Elections No. 1.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina submits the following privileged report.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Resolved*, That Walter Evans was not elected a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress of the United States from the Fifth Congressional district of Kentucky and is not entitled to a seat therein.

*Resolved*, That Oscar Turner was elected a member of the Fifty-sixth Congress from the Fifth Congressional district of the State of Kentucky and is entitled to a seat in the Fifty-sixth Congress.

Mr. LINNEY. Mr. Speaker, as I am informed there is to be no minority report, I ask for the immediate consideration of the resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves that the report of the committee be agreed to.

The resolutions were agreed to.

On motion of Mr. LINNEY, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CONTESTED ELECTION—PEARSON VS. CRAWFORD, NINTH DISTRICT, NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. ROBERTS, from Committee on Elections No. 3, presented the report of the committee in the contested-election case of Pearson vs. Crawford, Ninth district, North Carolina, stating that it was agreed to in the committee that the minority should be given ten days in which to present their views.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, ten days will be allowed the minority in which to present their views.

There was no objection.

The report was ordered to be printed and referred to the House Calendar.

#### DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

And then, on motion of Mr. HITT, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7941) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to dispense with the first formal reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks to dispense with the first formal reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HITT. Now, Mr. Chairman, before proceeding further, I should like to make some agreement with the gentleman representing the minority of the committee as to the time desired for general debate.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], the chairman of the committee, that I have had applications from a number of gentlemen who desire to speak. Several gentlemen on the committee desire to be heard, and one or two others have asked for an opportunity to address the House on this bill. So I suggest to the gentleman that we let this day be devoted to discussion of the bill under general debate, without placing any other limitation upon it.

Mr. HITT. I think, Mr. Chairman, with such an arrangement, the practical result would be to give the time substantially to the minority, and only a small part of it will be asked for by the majority, as far as I am advised, and I will make that agreement on behalf of my colleagues, that we close the general debate to-day. The committee can rise when general debate is closed, and we will proceed to read the bill by paragraphs to-morrow.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, that was not my proposition to the gentleman. I suggested that we place no limitation as yet upon the general debate; that we agree only to devote this day to general debate and leave it until to-morrow morning to determine what limitation shall be placed upon it. I hope we shall be able to get through with it to-day, but I am doubtful about it, if anybody speaks upon the other side, because of the applications to speak on this side. I would rather have a more liberal allowance than that. I am sure there is plenty of time.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Colorado?

Mr. HITT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Colorado for such remarks as he desires.

Mr. SHAFROTH. Mr. Chairman, I understand from the ranking member on this side of the House that he has received applications from members of the committee that will consume all of the time that will be allotted to him on this side. I will state that I should like to talk—

Mr. HITT. I will supplement his statement by saying that I will give him some additional time which belongs to our side of the House, which we do not expect to consume.

Mr. SHAFROTH. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that it seems to me that the proposition of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE] is fair, and that debate ought to be extended in this matter, at least for a reasonable time. I should like to have some time myself to finish a talk that I started here the other day. If that time is given, why, of course, it will be satisfactory to me that we finish to-day, if no other member desires to occupy more time.

Mr. DINSMORE. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it is unusual to allow such a short time as this. There is no demand now on the time of the House. We have been meeting and adjourning and transacting very little business, and I think if gentlemen desire to be heard they ought to be indulged.

Mr. HITT. What would the gentleman say to 2 o'clock to-morrow as the time at which to close general debate?

Mr. DINSMORE. I would rather leave it open entirely.

Mr. HITT. We can settle that at any time. I will assent to the gentleman's proposition that to-day be devoted to general debate.

Mr. DINSMORE. Leave it until to-morrow to determine at what hour debate shall close.

Mr. HITT. And the committee will rise when it sees fit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that no arrangement has been made.

Mr. HITT. There is an arrangement as to general debate—that it shall continue and consume this day, and that no vote shall be taken to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. That is simply a statement of the gentleman, and it has not been put to the committee as the request of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HITT. I request, then, that general debate only be in order for to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that general debate alone be in order for to-day upon this appropriation bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. The time will be controlled, I suppose, according to usage.

The CHAIRMAN. Without some arrangement, that would not be so.

Mr. HITT. The gentleman from Arkansas can suggest an arrangement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the time may be equally divided between the two sides of the committee, to be controlled on the one side by the gentleman from Illinois and on the other by the gentleman from Arkansas. Is there objection to that request? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, before general debate begins, which will not have much to do with the bill, I will say a word about the measure itself as it is before the House. It appropriates the money to support the consular and diplomatic service of the United States for the next fiscal year. The amount is \$1,743,408.76, or \$31,875 more than we appropriated last year, and some \$152,440 less than the estimates of the Department. I will say to gentlemen to whom the bill may not be familiar, that this apparent appropriation is far greater than the real burden to the Treasury and to the taxpayer.

Half of the amount that is appropriated is paid into the service by the officers of the Government. Over \$900,000 was paid into the Treasury by the consuls. Many of the other items that are in this bill which seem very large are in their nature contingent, and are rarely if ever all expended, sometimes not one-fifth; but it is always deemed prudent to make these appropriations for apparently considerable sums of expenditure. Some of them are not nearly all expended and some, as, for instance, expenses on extradition cases, is all reimbursed by the foreign governments; so that the sum to be taxed upon the people and drawn from the Treasury is far less than the amount stated in the face of the bill.

The bill is substantially a repetition of existing legislation. By the rules of the House the committee is forbidden to make changes in existing law, and we have only made changes in those items which are of such elastic nature that they can be considered as subject under the rules to change in amount. Though the expenditure is for an object authorized by existing law, some salary appropriations have increased apparently, because a number of officers are in this bill for the first time paid by fixed salaries,

where they have heretofore been paid by fees. They now appear for the first time upon this bill as increases apparently.

Such offices are at Aden, on the Red Sea; at Chihuahua, Mexico; Ensenada, Mexico. The difference between the amount paid heretofore as fees and the amount of the salary now given is so inconsiderable that it is hardly perceptible. At Aden, where the fees now amount to \$1,479, the salary is fixed at \$1,500. At Chihuahua the fees were \$1,430, and that is made a salaried consulate at \$1,500. It is desirable always that the compensation of the officers of the Government should be fixed and the various sums stated plainly in the law. For the information of the House I have stated these changes.

There is some increase in the amount allowed for contingent expenses of foreign missions, namely, \$20,000, but really an increase of \$17,000 appropriated, as \$5,000 for the inspection of diplomatic and consular offices, heretofore a separate item, is put in the category of contingent expenses for foreign missions, and it will be paid out of this contingent fund. For the Mexican Boundary Commission \$20,000 is appropriated. When the matter was before the committee they first cut it down \$5,000, but at the last moment, on a statement from the Secretary of State that it was needed immediately for the Government's pressing wants, it was put at \$20,000.

There were a large number of recommendations by the Department which we could not under the rules accede to, increasing the salaries paid to consuls at many points where they are too low, and also in the allowances for clerk hire. We have taken one, where the highest amount of labor is done in the transaction of business, at London, where the consul-general himself has to pay for additional hire. We have taken and added the sum paid by him and made the allowance.

The bill, gentlemen, is a good bill. It was reported by the committee unanimously. I think it is inadequate provision for a service which itself is inadequate and ought to be increased and improved. I would have been glad to make better provision for a service that is increasing in its duties every year and a service that has proven more and more valuable every year to the great commercial interest, especially in promoting the enormous and rapidly increasing exportations of our manufactured goods everywhere.

In that work these men are our agents, furnishing information, promoting trade. They are a kind of propaganda all over the world for the sale of our products that are now invading every market. Their compensation and number ought to be increased, as they are increasing in their efficiency. I will now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE].

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the bill which has been reported from that committee has but few changes from the law of appropriations of last year for the diplomatic and consular service, and those changes are such as were suggested and demanded by changed conditions since the former law was enacted. Therefore, there is no necessity for any discussion of the measure in itself. It has been reported to the House unanimously from the committee. But, sir, I desire to avail myself of this opportunity to submit a few observations upon the general conditions in the country in relation to foreign affairs and in relation to our Government's action toward its recently acquired possessions or those which it is now struggling to acquire.

I will read, in the first place, Mr. Chairman, from the President's annual message sent to Congress at the beginning of the present session, in which we find this language:

The withdrawal of the authority of Spain from the island of Cuba was effected by the 1st of January, so that the full reestablishment of peace found the relinquished territory held by us in trust for the inhabitants, maintaining, under the direction of the Executive, such government and control therein as should conserve public order, restore the productive conditions of peace so long disturbed by the instability and disorder which prevailed for the greater part of the preceding three decades, and build up that tranquil development of the domestic state whereby alone can be realized the high purpose, as proclaimed in the joint resolution adopted by the Congress on the 19th of April, 1898, by which the United States disclaimed any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over Cuba, except for the pacification thereof, and asserted its determination when that was accomplished to leave the government and control of the island to its people. The pledge contained in this resolution is of the highest honorable obligation and must be sacredly kept.

So said the President of the United States, and when he used this language I believe that he earnestly felt what he uttered, that it was his purpose, so far as he was able as the Chief Executive, to see that the faith pledged in the resolution of Congress that he recites should be kept by this Government. In connection with this message, I want to call the attention of the House to one or two incidents. Just after it was sent to Congress by the President the Committee on Rules, which has complete control of procedure in the House, reported a resolution creating a new committee to take jurisdiction of certain legislative matters.

That committee was styled, is styled, the Committee on Insular Affairs. It was supposedly created to take jurisdiction of matters appertaining to the undisputed territory of the United States.

Prior to the creation of this committee the Committee on Foreign Affairs had jurisdiction of all things appertaining to the relations between the United States and Cuba. Presumably it was not done because of any doubt of the ability of the Foreign Affairs Committee to continue successfully to manage that business.

The resolution, before it was referred to the Committee on Rules and reported back, did not provide for the transfer of that jurisdiction to the Committee on Insular Affairs; but the Committee on Rules, for some reason best known to its members, provided by the resolution that the jurisdiction should be taken away from the Committee on Foreign Affairs. What was it, Mr. Chairman? What motive impelled them to that action? The Committee on Rules does not act without some purpose. The resolution as introduced in the House, before it was reported back by the Committee on Rules, did not provide for the transfer of the jurisdiction.

Why, I ask again, did they see proper to make such a transfer to the new committee from the Committee on Foreign Affairs? The new committee has its hands full of the business relative to other matters, and the Committee on Foreign Affairs is left with practically, at this time, nothing to do. I am glad that, since the Committee on Foreign Affairs is relieved of the business and it has gone to the Committee on Insular Affairs, a committee very able in its personnel, that our very able chairman [Mr. HITT] was made a member also of the new committee. I am not especially jealous of the fact that the jurisdiction has been taken away from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, but I deplore the fact that this action on the part of the Committee on Rules has an appearance of a purpose not to carry out the will of the President as expressed in his message, but to give color to a pretension which may be later boldly asserted, that we have rights in the island of Cuba beyond the pledge of Congress, and, in violation of it, that there is an ultimate purpose to destroy the liberties which our men fought for at Santiago and achieved for the Cubans. I do not impute to any particular person bad motives.

I do not say that men act dishonestly; I believe there is not a gentleman in this House who, if confronted with the proposition contained in the President's language with reference to Cuba, would not assert that that is the purpose of Congress. He would resent indignantly any imputation that he had any other purpose, but at the same time it is in the atmosphere and we hear it on all hands that other things will happen; doubts are expressed, not only by the ordinary individual in the common walks of life, but by men of official character, although not making the statement officially, as to whether the United States Government will ever relinquish its hold on the island of Cuba.

Why all this talk, Mr. Chairman, about who shall haul down the flag? It is as applicable to Cuba as it is to the Philippines. Who shall haul it down, they say, where once its folds have sheltered any territory? It must be left and never pulled down. I myself have heard from individuals the assertion that we never will abandon Cuba. We are told that we dare not leave the Philippines to themselves; that they are incapable of self-government. Are they more so than the Cubans? Admiral Dewey has told us they are less so.

Now, let us consider the conditions in Cuba and in the Philippines at the outbreak of the war and compare them with each other.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I should be glad if the gentleman from Arkansas, in this connection, would state whether he would be in favor of the annexation of Cuba if the people of Cuba so voted.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Chairman, I say to the gentleman that I have for a long time, as a citizen of this country, felt a desire that at some time we should possess the island of Cuba; and if at any time I recognized that there had been a full, free, fair, untrammelled expression of a desire on the part of the Cuban people themselves to be admitted into this Union, they coming in with a proper form of government to entitle them to admission, and their people were prepared for it, I would favor it. I will say furthermore to my friend that never would I favor any such method as that adopted when the Hawaiian Islands were annexed, when the people of those islands were not consulted—nobody, practically, except a lot of missionaries, traders, and commercial adventurers.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I referred simply to a full and complete vote on the part of the people of Cuba, asking for admission.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, I have answered the gentleman as definitely as I could and, I hope, to his satisfaction. I do not want to be drawn beyond the limits which I have set for myself in this discussion and which I propose to follow in a general and brief way.

But if the flag can not be pulled down in the Philippines because the honor of the nation is involved, and so it is said; if we have pledged to civilization anything in behalf of the inhabitants of the Philippines, is it not fully so with regard to the Cubans? There



is at least this to be said: With reference to Cuba, we defined what honor demands, in the name of liberty, by Congressional action. Yet it seems, according to the President, that honor demands one thing in Cuba and another in the Philippines. Admiral Dewey has told us that the Filipinos are more capable of self-government than the Cubans. He has said that he is familiar with the two peoples and that in his view the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands are more capable of self-government than the Cubans. Is not liberty as dear to one as to the other?

Mr. Chairman, the Cubans and the Filipinos have suffered under the same cruel oppression and tyranny of the same despotic power. When we went to their relief the people of Cuba were in insurrection against that tyranny and so were the Filipinos, each having organized armies, the army of the Filipinos the larger one and more capable and better armed than that of Cuba, both struggling for liberty with the same cause, the same justification exactly, though their interests and revolutionary actions were not mutual.

When Cuba, which is nearer to our own borders, sent up her cries of distress, drawn forth by Spanish persecutions, which were unheeded, the people of the United States, after patient and earnest protests, demanded that action should be taken on the part of this Government in their behalf.

Why? For the purpose of territorial acquisition? Not at all; that we specifically disavowed; but because the condition of suffering, distress, and oppression in Cuba appealed to the sympathy of the most liberty-loving people on earth, a people who have established for themselves a government under which liberty abounds and whose people desire to see it enjoyed by all who aspire to independence and freedom. By a solemn resolution of Congress we declared that they were and of right ought to be free and independent; we invoked the power of this great Government to make them so; and for fear of that spirit of greed which dwells in the minds of men grasping after money, we provided in that resolution that it was not the purpose of the United States to carry on a war of conquest or to exercise any dominion or control in the island of Cuba, but to give those people freedom and then to withdraw our forces.

The country is familiar with conditions existing in Cuba at the outbreak of hostilities, and the official correspondence of our consular officers on file in the State Department, published with other important correspondence, which I shall allude to hereafter, in Senate Document 62, has informed us equally well the state of affairs in the Philippines. The conditions were exactly similar. Consul Williams, writing from Manila to the State Department on February 22, 1898, said:

Peace was proclaimed. \* \* \* but there is no peace and has been none for about two years. Conditions here and in Cuba are practically alike. War exists, battles are of almost daily occurrence, and ambulances bring in many wounded, and hospitals are full. Prisoners are brought here and shot without trial, and Manila is under martial law.

Writing again, March 19, 1898, Mr. Williams said:

Insurrection is rampant; many killed, wounded, and made prisoners on both sides. A battle ship, the *Don Juan de Austria*, sent this week to the northern part of Luzon to cooperate with a land force of 2,000, dispatched to succor local forces, overwhelmed by rebels.

Rebellion never more threatening to Spain. \* \* \* Rebels getting arms, money and friends, and they outnumber the Spaniards, resident and soldiery, probably a hundred to one.

In his letter of March 27, Mr. Williams said:

Cuban conditions exist here possibly in aggravated form. Spanish soldiers are killed and wounded daily, despite claimed pacification, and the hospitals are kept full.

When our forces are to be withdrawn I can not say; no other gentleman can say; but I hope it may be early. Yet I have grave fears that it will be never, notwithstanding the President's message, saying our "pledge is of the highest honorable obligation and must be sacredly kept." We know his and his party's purpose in the Philippines, and we doubt. People who will not recognize a moral obligation because it is not evidenced by a sealed contract may easily find a way to break the terms of a written bond, especially so when the reasons assigned for the justification of the one are, if true at all, which I deny, equally applicable to the other. What great differences exist that we are impelled on the one hand to act in the name of liberty and on the other for the purpose of oppression and in denial of freedom?

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. DINSMORE. Certainly. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. PEARCE of Missouri. I do not desire to interrupt the thread of my friend's argument, but his views are always interesting to me, and I would like him before he concludes his remarks to elaborate an affirmative proposition as to what, in his judgment, would be a proper solution of the Philippine problem.

Mr. DINSMORE. I shall be very glad to do so, and I do not know that there will be a better opportunity than the present, because I have no prepared speech to deliver.

Let us take a retrospect for only a moment. If there are any

embarrassments or difficulties presented to us to-day in withdrawing our forces from those islands or in taking a position which does not look to ultimate and permanent sovereignty, that condition is due to the fault of ourselves, and not to the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

But whatever the embarrassment may be to-day, I say, without hesitation so far as I am concerned, that in respect to every tradition of this Government, with respect to our Constitution, with respect to the Declaration of Independence, which breathes a holy assertion of the principles of liberty and the rights of all men to participate in their own government and control, in view of our own interests, commercial and industrial, this Government should officially say now—we having failed to say it formerly, as we should have done—to those people who are in arms against the United States: "It is not our purpose to acquire permanent sovereignty over you. It is not our purpose to hold you in subjection and to force upon you a government to which you yourselves have objected. We will not do so. We offer to you our friendly assistance to restore peace and order and to establish a government of your own."

That is what they expected of us in the beginning; and if that proposition had been made to them at any time during the progress of this war, it is my belief that they would have come to terms and laid down their arms, and there would have been a cessation of hostilities. And having done this, I would make a treaty with that government on the part of the United States and withdraw from it and no longer be responsible for it otherwise than as provided for in that treaty. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

That is easy of accomplishment. Why not? What peculiar obligations rest upon us that will prevent us from doing that?

There are two arguments used, two reasons assigned on the part of the annexationists. The one is in the name of civilization and alleged humanitarianism, the other in the name of trade and commerce. These two alone.

The speeches we hear are not arguments directed to reason; they are appeals to sentiment, to the hearts of the people, their love for the flag, and they charge us with interfering with the progress of American arms, and we have been branded in the yellow journals, and even by men in high official station, as "traitors" and "copperheads."

Mr. Chairman, the flag is a prolific theme. The mere mention of the flag of our country stirs the hearts of all Americans. When an appeal is made in its name by the sophist, it reaches the unreflecting and carries them away at times. Who does not love the flag! We love it because it is the emblem of liberty; because it is the ensign under which this great country has grown in prosperity and wealth and happiness and power; because it stands for the liberty of the individual citizen and for the right of the people to govern themselves, and never, until this new era of dishonor, has it ever been emblematic of anything else.

"Who will haul it down?" I should say that a President of the United States, loving that flag for itself and every association, loving it because it means the best things that have ever been accomplished in this country—and if the simple principles of our Constitution and our system of government are adhered to, as in the past, it means more and greater growth in happiness and material prosperity—that that President, unwilling that the flag should stand for anything other than is consistent with our professions in the past, our life as a nation and a people, should, by his own order, have it taken down where it means the subjugation of any people on earth against their own will. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] the other day made a very happy and eloquent speech as an annexationist. I listened to him with a great deal of pleasure. I always do. I have for him the kindest feeling of affection, and my admiration of his speech on that occasion was not in the least disparaged by the fact that I knew he could make just as eloquent a speech and a much stronger one upon the other side of the question, and probably will before he is two years older. I am justified in making that statement by the fact that I have heard him make very able speeches on two sides of a question quite as important as this since I have been in Congress.

He glorifies the flag. He says that he is an optimist, and I truly think he is, in the superlative degree. I can not, like him, plant myself on hope alone, and without reference to practical conditions, in disregard of the operation of legal and constitutional restraints, forgetting our best and holiest traditions, bidding defiance to the things that have wrecked governments in other lands and other ages, declare my belief "that on this continent God has willed to plant a people who shall carry the arts of peace and the story of the cross to the nations of the earth" and at the same time offer the sword and the bayonet as the instruments of that achievement. God hath said, "They that live by the sword shall perish by the sword."

My friend used this language with reference to Rome, which I recall, and quote from the RECORD:

Mr. Speaker, we have held up to us for warning the history of Persia and Greece, of Babylon and Rome. They have flourished and have faded. They had their morning hour and their meridian and went out in the blackness of night. Rome expanded until like a wheel, the spokes radiated from the hub throughout Europe, Asia, and Africa. The collapse of her power and of every empire of the past came not from the weakness of the periphery of the wheel, but from the rottenness of the hub.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what we, of conservative position upon this question, desire to prevent for our own country—the rotting of the hub. The gentleman is correct, but when the periphery was extended to such remote bounds, when so many spokes were crowded into the hub, when an enormous military establishment became necessary to keep in subjection and order all this wide domain over which Rome exercised control, then it was that the possibility arose for corruptions to begin at the center of government and the hub became strained and split and cracked and rotten, and the whole Empire came tumbling down, a mighty heap of ruin upon the heads of people who had enjoyed liberty before.

We would pursue a conservative, safe course in this country. We desire to refrain from expanding our dominion away out into the islands of the sea, because we believe it is dangerous; because we believe the creation of great standing armies is not only expensive and a drain upon the substance of the people, but that it imperils their liberties; because we believe that it tempts the jealousy of other nations and makes us a party to the contest going on in the great Orient for the possession of territory when we do not need it for our own uses.

I do not believe, Mr. Chairman, in the theory of commerce by military establishment. I believe that commerce follows peace. I do not believe in the trade of the bayonet; I believe in the trade of the pen and countinghouse. I do not believe in the trade of the man-of-war with bristling cannon; I believe in the trade of the ship that flies under the white sails of peace and friendship and thrift and competition, bearing our commerce to every clime and offering it to the world upon terms which are reciprocally beneficial to it and to us. This is the true theory of commerce, and no other can be justified. By it we maintain peace and friendly relations with all the world. By the other we constantly hazard the liberty of the people and endanger our Government to disturbances and embarrassments with foreign powers.

But, Mr. Chairman, I ask the House to reflect a moment upon the theory of commerce as a justification of the Administration's policy. If this war is being waged for money, that there shall be additional trade established for the benefit of those who sell and buy in this country, what is the price that we pay? It is not only the millions of dollars that go out from the Treasury to maintain permanent armies; it is not only the millions of dollars that will be necessary in the future to maintain colonies under military rule; not that alone; we are paying for it in the precious blood of our land. Who shall adjudge the value of an American soldier's life? Who shall place it in the scale with trade and dollars and material wealth?

Who shall say how many lives we will be justified in expending for the establishment of the trade which gentlemen value so highly? The soldier must do his duty. His duty is to obey orders, and the President is his officer of supreme command. No matter what the danger, what the cause. Soldiers know nothing of causes. When ordered to fight the Filipino, could they refuse?

Not tho' the soldier knew  
Some one had blundered:  
Theirs not to make reply,  
Theirs not to reason why,  
Theirs but to do and die.

Ah, Mr. Chairman, the blunders of this Administration have accomplished a fearful harvest of death. The Washington Post two days ago gave this telegram from San Francisco:

REMAINS OF 800 AMERICAN SOLDIERS.

SAN FRANCISCO, February 2, 1899.

A cable from Manila was received from the quartermaster's department stating that the *Hancock* sailed for San Francisco on January 19 with the bodies of 462 dead soldiers. The *Indiana* is expected in immediately with 200 bodies, and the *Ohio*, with 138, arrived to-day.

Over 800 dead soldiers brought back to their native land. Dead, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen. Dead, Mr. President and Messrs. Commissioners. Dead, as a logical, inevitable result of your blundering, grasping policy. Sacrifices offered up by this Administration in the name of trade, in the cause of greed, in the cause of a false and hypocritical philanthropy. I protest against it. Even this morning the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] arose to announce that the gallant General Lawton to-day lies in his native city in state, with his comrades and his friends weeping about him.

That great life was given as a sacrifice, an enforced sacrifice, by this Administration to establish domination in the Philippine Islands. By what right are these 800 lives sacrificed? And there have been many more and there will be yet more. These boys who went away a few months ago under orders, and bearing upon

their lips the parting kiss of sweetheart, sister, wife, and mother, followed across the seas by prayers of loved ones at home, are now returning cold and dead, bringing a pall of gloom into thousands of homes. Ten thousand weepers and mourners will stand about them, and pour out tears before the broken forms of those that "sleep the sleep that knows no waking." And may I be permitted to ask of the President, of every Republican in the country, and of my good friend from Pennsylvania, how many more American lives they feel justified in sacrificing, how many more homes shall be made desolate, in the name of trade and "mercy?"

That is the price that is being paid for the domination of the United States in the Philippines; that is the sacrifice that is being exacted by the President. Is it with the consent of the people? Was it done with the consent of Congress? Congress was not consulted in regard to the action to be taken in the Philippines. This calamitous condition was brought upon us by the action of the Administration, by the Executive and his officers.

He sent his commission to Paris to effect a treaty of peace. There was but one thing that stood as an obstruction to the speedy accomplishment of that purpose. They demanded cession of the Philippines. Under instructions, the American commissioners held the knife at the throat of a prostrate, beaten antagonist, and holding out \$20,000,000 as a bribe, added to intimidation, induced him to yield a reluctant consent; \$20,000,000 were given as consideration for the privilege or as a pretext to crush the Filipinos and force them into subjection to this Government against their will; \$20,000,000 were paid for an excuse to sacrifice thousands of lives of Americans and islanders in the name of God and trade; and gentlemen call this "carrying the arts of peace and the story of the Cross to the nations of the earth."

How does this appear to you? What kind of sentiment does it engender, what feeling inspire, in view of all that was said and done in the cause of liberty for Cuba? Now, "honor" demands that we must wage cruel war against the Filipinos to force them to submit to that which under the dictates of honor we freed the Cubans of. So it runs all through, the same character of dissimulation and false pretense, for I must call it that; and they insist that we are now committed to it forever by the action of the Filipinos themselves, which is but adding one degree more of hypocrisy.

Mr. Chairman, when we have cited them to the fact that we gave the Filipinos cause to believe that we would assist them to independence, and that we sought and had their cooperation in fighting the Spaniards, that by their aid the Spaniard was crushed in Luzon, they say there was no cooperation. There was a practical alliance between our forces and Aguinaldo; but this, too, is denied.

A commission appointed by the President, in their "preliminary report," which was filed and referred to Congress by the President with his message, says there never was any cooperation. While battling for the liberty of the people in Cuba when we asserted the sovereign right of all men to control their own destinies, or at least participate in that control, it became necessary to strike the enemy in the Orient.

He had a fleet in Manila Bay. He had garrisons in the Philippine Islands. All are familiar with our wonderful victory in Manila Bay. But while Dewey held the bay Aguinaldo and his patriot army pressed the land forces of the enemy to the very verge of the sea and could have taken the city of Manila any day. There was no cooperation say the commission. How came Aguinaldo there? Go to the official reports of our own officers and ascertain. United States Consul-General Pratt at Singapore held frequent interviews with Aguinaldo before the battle of Manila, and through him communication was had between Dewey and Aguinaldo, which led to the latter's accepting passage on a United States ship of war and going to Manila and taking command of the insurgent army by the assistance and advice of Admiral Dewey, who furnished him with arms.

Before Admiral Dewey left Hongkong for Manila Consul-General Pratt wired him from Singapore that Aguinaldo was willing to join him "for general cooperation, if desired." Those were the words. What was Dewey's answer? "Tell Aguinaldo come soon as possible." Aguinaldo arrived at Hongkong too late to go with Dewey, but so important was his presence and cooperation esteemed that by Dewey's orders he was taken on board the *McCulloch* and conveyed to Manila. What further evidence is there of cooperation? On July 4 Gen. Thomas Anderson, commanding the United States land forces, wrote to Aguinaldo, having been placed by Dewey at the head of the insurgent army, as follows:

General, I have the honor to inform you that the United States of America, whose land forces I have the honor to command in this vicinity, being at war with the Kingdom of Spain, has entire sympathy and most friendly sentiments for the native people of the Philippine Islands. For these reasons I desire to have the most amicable relations with you, and to have you and your people cooperate with us in military operations against the Spanish forces, etc.

Now, this same commission tells you that not until long after



that, until after the Spaniards had been crushed, did Aguinaldo or his followers ever express a desire for independence. But here Admiral Dewey tells you in this dispatch to the Department, dated June 27, that he has gone to attend a meeting of the insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government.

DEWEY'S DISPATCH.

HONGKONG, June 27, 1898.

SECRETARY OF NAVY, Washington:

Receipt of telegram of June 14 is acknowledged. Aguinaldo, insurgent leader, with 13 of his staff, arrived May 19, by permission, on *Nanshan*. Established self Cavite, outside arsenal, under the protection of our guns, and organized his army. I have had several conferences with him, generally of a personal nature. Consistently I have refrained from assisting him in any way with the force under my command, and on several occasions I have declined requests that I should do so, telling him the squadron could not act until the arrival of the United States troops. At the same time I have given him to understand that I consider insurgents as friends, being opposed to a common enemy. He has gone to attend a meeting of insurgent leaders for the purpose of forming a civil government. Aguinaldo has acted independently of the squadron, but has kept me advised of his progress, which has been wonderful. I have allowed to pass by water recruits, arms, and ammunition, and to take such Spanish arms and ammunition from the arsenal as he needed. Have advised frequently to conduct the war humanely, which he has done invariably. \* \* \* In my opinion, these people are far superior in their intelligence and more capable of self-government than the natives of Cuba, and I am familiar with both races.

DEWEY.

Is this cooperation? He says that he furnished him the means to get arms for his people. That he acted independently it is true, but under the advice of Dewey, and Dewey commends him for the manner in which he is discharging the duty which is expected of him by Dewey and the military commanders that he shall perform.

"They did not expect independence." Why, Mr. Chairman, one of the most pathetic things in the history of all the transactions, in view of what is now said and the contention of people in Congress and of the Administration, is contained in a proclamation of joy which the insurgent representatives in Hongkong sent to the people in the Philippine Islands after the conference with Pratt, after Dewey had gone to Manila to strike the Spaniards. Here it is—a part of it—of the proclamation to the Filipinos from their leaders, the Filipino junta, in Hongkong:

Compatriots, Divine Providence is about to place independence within our reach. The Americans, not from any mercenary motives, but for the sake of humanity, have considered it opportune to extend their protecting mantle to our beloved country. Where you see the American flag flying, assemble in mass. They are our redeemers.

Does that read as if they hoped for independence? But that is not the only significance of this dispatch. Mr. Rounseville Wildman, United States consul at Hongkong, had advised with Aguinaldo throughout, and says himself that he (Wildman) outlined the proclamation Aguinaldo issued to his people. This is his language:

Immediately on the arrival of Aguinaldo at Cavite he issued a proclamation, which I had outlined for him before he left, forbidding pillage and making it a criminal offense to maltreat neutrals. He, of course, organized a government of which he was dictator, an absolutely necessary step if he hoped to maintain control over the natives, and from that date until the present time he has been uninterruptedly successful in the field and dignified and just as the head of his government. According to his own statements to me by letter, he has been approached by both the Spaniards and the Germans, and has had tempting offers made him by the Catholic Church. He has been watched very closely by Admiral Dewey, Consul Williams, and his own junta here in Hongkong, and nothing of moment has occurred which would lead anyone to believe that he was not carrying out to the letter the promises made to me in this consulate.

Here is proof both of abundant cooperation and of the hope and expectation of the Filipinos from the first for independence.

Does it appear that they wanted independence? Were they justified in sending their proclamation from Hongkong? They were justified in every view; by the position we had taken with reference to Cuba, by the solemn promise of the Congress of the United States in reference to Cuba, because they were exactly in the condition that we found the Cubans. They wanted us to assist them to independence and then withdraw.

Does anybody believe any Filipino insurgent or leader thought that our people had any other purpose than that? Does any member believe that Admiral Dewey ever expected anything else to occur? Do you believe that Otis, or any other general in command of the land forces, expected anything else? To have taken a position at the time these difficulties first occurred that we would pursue any other course than that which we pursued toward Cuba would have been an insult to the dignity and fair name of the United States Government. The Administration contends that the Filipinos opened hostilities against us.

To say so is not true. We began them ourselves. We fired the first shot. A soldier from a Kansas regiment fired upon a Filipino patrol between the lines of the American and insurgent forces. The fire was returned, and a number of the native soldiers were killed. Aguinaldo immediately expressed to General Otis his regret at the occurrence, distinctly disavowed any purpose of hostility, and offered to move his lines back as far as the American commander desired. Honor between men, honor between nations, honor in every sense demanded that this proposal should have been recognized in the interest of peace. But it was not. General Otis made the cruel reply that since the fighting had commenced, it

must go on to the bitter end. That end is not yet reached, and Otis is responsible.

Let us look a little further. These things are being done in the name of "benevolent assimilation" and other high-sounding phrases.

The President of the United States appointed his commission and sent them out to the Philippine Islands. That commission reports that the people of the Philippine Islands never dreamed of independence till after the Spaniards had been crushed and we had taken possession of Manila. The records tell you differently. The Singapore Press, reciting interviews between our officials and Aguinaldo, their correctness vouched for by United States Consul-General Pratt, controvert the statement. The proclamation of the Philippine representatives, made public to the world, tell you differently. The very struggle of those people striving for liberty itself gives the lie to the commission's statement.

After the Spaniards had capitulated, but before the treaty was concluded, the President issued a proclamation and sent it over to be promulgated by General Otis. General Otis took a very extraordinary liberty with that proclamation—a liberty which he was justified in taking in the cause of fairness and honesty, and for the purpose of preserving the good name of our country. Whether that was his motive must be ascertained by all that he said and did taken together, but it might well have been. That he did so is not denied. He himself reports the manner in which it was done. What does he say? General Otis reports—

After fully considering the President's proclamation and the temper of the Tagalos, with whom I was daily discussing political problems and the friendly intentions of the United States Government toward them, I concluded that there were certain words and expressions therein [the President's proclamation], such as "sovereignty," "right of cession," and those which directed immediate occupation, etc., which, though most admirably employed and tersely expressive of actual conditions, might be advantageously used by the Tagalo war party to incite widespread hostilities among the natives. The ignorant classes had been taught to believe that certain words, as "sovereignty," "protection," etc., had peculiar meaning disastrous to their welfare and significant of future political domination, like that from which they had recently been freed.

It was my opinion, therefore, that I would be justified in so amending the paper that the beneficent object of the United States Government would be brought clearly within the comprehension of the people, and this conclusion was the more readily reached because of the radical change of the past few days in the constitution of Aguinaldo's government, which could not have been understood at Washington at the time the proclamation was prepared. It was also believed that the proclamation had been induced partially by the suggestions of the naval authorities here, which three weeks previous, and while affairs were in a specific and comparatively quiet state, had recommended "that the President issue a proclamation defining the policy of the United States Government in the Philippine Islands and assuring the inhabitants that it is our intention to interfere as little as possible in the internal affairs of the islands; that as soon as they developed their capability for self-government their powers and privileges will be increased. That will allay the spirit of unrest."

What "beneficent object?" We could only have two purposes—one to assist those people in accordance with our pledge to the Cubans to establish a free government for themselves and the other to take away from them their liberty. One or the other of these must be our purpose. It developed in the President's proclamation that the purpose of the United States was to take away their liberty. But General Otis says, "We must disguise this purpose; we must so amend this proclamation that the Filipinos will not be misled and the benevolent purpose of the United States be misunderstood."

Why, Mr. Chairman, I can not believe otherwise than that General Otis at the time he took this liberty with the President's proclamation, believed that the language used by the President did not convey the purpose of the Administration. As a liberty-loving man, as a self-respecting American citizen bearing a commission from his Government, he was justified even in taking the position that the President used terms which he did not intend to use. If that was not his understanding, then his words which I have quoted are used as irony.

The sarcasm, the biting, burning sarcasm, with which he blisters the President of the United States in that dispatch amounts to insubordination for which he might have been court-martialed.

But, Mr. Chairman, a peculiar temper pervades the mind of the annexationist of to-day. It is needless to stand here and discuss the analogies between the acquisition of the Philippines and the acquisition of the Louisiana purchase. Why not come up and consider this question upon its merits?

Everybody knows that different reasons existed in the two cases; that different objections obtained. I shall not pause to discuss that phase of the question. The first question is, Do we need the Philippines; and if so, for what purpose? The second is, Have we the right, under the Constitution, to acquire them? And a third question is, If we have the right, and if we have a need for them, can we, under our traditions, under the broad pledge of this great Union of States, under every observance by which we have grown great and strong and mighty as a nation, afford to tear down the beautiful temple of liberty which we ourselves have constructed and make it a waste place and a burying ground for the blasted hopes of humanity—for the dead aspirations of those who have striven for freedom?

The President and his commission would have us believe that the natives—those engaged in resistance to our arms—are brutal and cruel and have no conception of free government, nor desire for it, and that if we withdraw, chaos would follow and lawlessness run riot; that they are incapable of forming a government. To refute this we have not only the direct testimony of Admiral Dewey, but he reports the testimony of officers whom he sent on a tour of inspection of 600 miles in the interior, where the Tagal government was in force.

I shall not go into a discussion of the constitutional questions involved in the Administration's purposes. My object is only to make plain what it is intended shall be done and how, and to expose the insincerity of the motives and plans, that the American people, who must ultimately determine this question for themselves, may know what they are to pass upon. I said a moment ago that a peculiar temper prevails. Men are inspired these days with great contempt for constitutional obstructions. Gentlemen of this House have been busy for weeks and are still engaged in seeking some constitutional sanction for imperialism, for holding subject provinces by military power. If they fail, and they will, I nevertheless expect to hear them assert it. They should, if they intend to persist in their purpose, be as honest as Mr. Whitelaw Reid. During the summer I received a copy of a speech delivered by him before the Miami University, in Ohio, upon the subject of the duty of the American Government in the Philippine Islands.

Mr. Reid takes up this question of constitutionality and the rights of the United States to acquire territory for purposes other than that of statehood. Under the Constitution, according to the contention of some, and as I myself believe, as interpreted in the decisions rendered by Chief Justice Marshall and followed by the Supreme Court in other decisions, our constitutional power is limited to acquiring territory for statehood. But I care not to discuss that. I am showing now the temper which possesses the minds of men. Mr. Whitelaw Reid takes up these decisions and refers to what Jefferson and Madison said. He comments upon what Senator Hoar has said and upon the decisions of Chief Justices Marshall and Taney, and he uses this startling language. I quote from memory:

I would not by a hair's breadth disparage the weight to be attached to the opinions and decisions of these learned men; but I can not believe that any dispassionate person can read these decisions and opinions in the light of surrounding circumstances and the conditions under which they were rendered and expressed and come to any other conclusion than that they are flimsy as a cobweb.

Behold, Mr. Chairman, a greater than Washington is here, a more profound and learned jurist than Marshall, a greater patriot than Jefferson, a wiser than any of the fathers—the gentleman who assisted in negotiating the treaty with Spain at the dagger's point and wrested from her her poor title to possession which she was not able to maintain against the insurrectionists themselves and to enforce her authority beyond the narrowest limits.

Not only does Mr. Reid say this; he goes further, and makes assertions each more startling and dangerous. I am sorry that I have not here a copy of his address. I tried to procure it, but was unable to find it in the Library or elsewhere. I state it from memory, but I pledge myself to the correctness of its substance, if I do not give it in the exact language, and I can almost do that. In speaking of the purposes of this Government and our possibilities as a nation, he says:

Neither chains forged in the Constitution, nor chains of precedent, nor yet the dead hand of the Father of his Country, whom we all revere, can prevent us as a nation from doing anything that any other nation could do or meeting any emergency which arises or discharging any obligation which imposes.

There you are! What useful function is left for the Constitution?

What is meant, Mr. Chairman, by this? When an emergency arises, the Constitution, if it stand in the way, will be disregarded. If an obligation imposes, we will discharge that obligation without reference to the organic law of the land—throw it aside, just as his colleague and compeers have cast aside the Declaration of Independence and trodden it under foot. We will not be bound by chains forged in the Constitution. We will perform our purpose, whatever that purpose may be.

Mr. Chairman, who is to determine when the emergency arises? Who is to decide when an obligation is imposed? If we cast ourselves loose from all moorings to constitutional safeguards, then we are left to the opinion of any bare majority which may get control of the affairs of the Government, and in this instance we should be left to the dictation of a class of statesmen whom I for one am unwilling to intrust with the sacred rights of the people unrestrained by "chains forged in the Constitution."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ALLEN of Maine). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have leave to finish his remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas be allowed to finish his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINSMORE. Are the Filipinos to become citizens under the new order of things, enjoying equal rights with us? Nobody will be bold enough to propose that. Mr. Whitelaw Reid, in the address to which I have referred, says that "it is not to be considered or thought of; they are not fit for it; they can not be made so;" and he holds that they should be held as a subject province under the dominion of the United States, suffering such impositions as we impose upon them, and denied the blessings that are enjoyed by our citizens. Is this Americanism? When did it become so?

Why, Mr. Chairman, the very thing our fathers fought against was taxation without representation. Can it be that England had no right in justice or morals to impose such burdens upon us, who were confessedly her subjects, and that we may honorably and rightly exercise such power over the Filipinos, who have never owed us any kind of allegiance? I am sorry indeed to find people who seem to think so.

Have we already advanced the car of liberty so far that we may now reverse its wheels? Have we done so much for the fair goddess that we may now turn and rend her? Oh, that patriotism might inspire the hearts of Americans with love of country rather than desire for conquest and greed for ill-got gold!

Oh, that our people might be governed now, as in the past, by the one desire to make of this a great proud republic, where peace may ever abide and the happiness of our citizens at home be the chief aim, the first purpose of the laws. Shall our flag, that we all love because it has ever been the emblem of liberty, of the universal equality of man, of his right to govern himself, of the immortal principle that government derives its just powers from the consent of the governed, whose bright constellation and flowing stripes remind us of our growth in power and dominion and happiness, while adhering to the safe traditions grown out of the Declaration of Independence—shall it be the ensign that shall float over the heads of people held in subjection to our laws by military power against their will, laws that discriminate against them and deny them participation in the blessings that we enjoy? God preserve it from such disgrace. God restrain our people from the perpetration of such a wrong. God make us strong in the future, as we have been in the past, for the establishment and promotion of liberty in our own land, by the light of our example inspiring it throughout all the world. [Loud applause.]

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I wish to ask the gentleman one question, if he will answer it.

Mr. DINSMORE. With pleasure, if I can.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. There is, of course, a great diversity of opinion among those who are honestly seeking to arrive at a conclusion as to the most honorable course to be pursued in the treatment of the Philippine Islands, both immediately and in the future. Is it the gentleman's view that the United States troops in the Philippines should be immediately withdrawn and leave the Filipinos absolutely to their own devices?

Mr. DINSMORE. Immediately?

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. That they be immediately left to their own devices?

Mr. DINSMORE. I do not think they ought to be immediately withdrawn. I have already stated to the House that I think our course with reference to them should be the same as our course was promised to be to Cuba, whether we ever fulfill it or not. I hold that the highest and first duty of the American Government is to our own people, without reference to what may happen to anybody else. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman one further question. Would the gentleman be in favor of the retention of the Philippines at the request of the Filipinos?

Mr. DINSMORE. Oh, well, Mr. Chairman, that is the same question propounded with reference to Cuba.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I am asking it honestly and sincerely.

Mr. DINSMORE. I would not. If I could be satisfied that a substantial majority of Cubans should desire it, I might be willing to take them; but the Philippines, so remote from us—I care not what may be said about the obliteration of time and distance in communication—and so near to other powers struggling for supremacy in the Orient, I would not be willing to take under any view.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. So numerous and so alien.

Mr. DINSMORE. Yes; so filled with people who never can be homogeneous with us. I do not want them. I think they would be an injury rather than a blessing to us.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Does the gentleman from Arkansas think that if we retained the Philippines with the consent of the Filipinos it would be of commercial advantage or disadvantage to this country?

Mr. DINSMORE. I think it would be an absolute impossibility within years to come for us to know whether we had the consent of the Filipinos, particularly while we are in military occupation. Let me say that I do not care how much they might desire it, I should be opposed ever to taking them, because I think it would be a menace to us and a danger, without compensating advantages.



Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I agree with the gentleman that it may be difficult to ascertain the opinion of all the Filipinos; but supposing by a proper plebiscite they should request retention by the United States, does the gentleman think it would be to the advantage or the disadvantage of the United States from a commercial point of view?

Mr. DINSMORE. I do not think it would be of any advantage to us from a commercial point of view. I have already stated that I believe that healthful, desirable, profitable trade follows peace rather than war, thrift rather than force, and that we should maintain relations of peace with the world and adhere to the injunction of our fathers to keep free from entangling alliances. I believe that an adherence to the Monroe doctrine rather than a departure from it would promote our commerce, our happiness, and our safety.

One more word in closing. Mr. Chairman, I have a horrible fear that if this thing is done, it may be the beginning of the end. It will be done unless prevented by the people in the ensuing election. The decree of the Administration has gone forth. When Americans deprive other people of liberty as they desire it, I tremble for our own. Perhaps the roseate view of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY] is the correct one, but mine at least accords with history in the past, and his is based only upon hope and pride of race. [Applause.]

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LACEY having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

- S. 746. An act to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia;
- S. 707. An act for the relief of Charles T. Rader;
- S. 421. An act for the relief of Napoleon B. Giddings;
- S. 422. An act for the relief of George A. Orr;
- S. 423. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack;
- S. 424. An act for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.;
- S. 425. An act for the relief of John M. Davis;
- S. 426. An act for the relief of Ezra S. Havens;
- S. 427. An act for the relief of A. F. Fleet;
- S. 428. An act for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters, widow of J. E. Gillingwaters;
- S. 432. An act for the relief of James W. Howell, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers;
- S. 433. An act for the relief of Richard C. Silence;
- S. 436. An act to correct the military record of Perry J. Knoles;
- S. 437. An act for the relief of Isaac McConaughay, private, Company H, Fortieth Iowa Infantry Volunteers;
- S. 438. An act for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree;
- S. 439. An act for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard;
- S. 359. An act to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable goods to the port of Astoria, Oreg.;
- S. 1590. An act for the erection of a public building at Providence, R. I.;
- S. 2727. An act authorizing payment of commutation of ration to the petty officers of the Navy who served on detached duty between March 1, 1898, and November 4, 1899; and
- S. R. 51. Joint resolution recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson*; of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgson, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments joint resolution (H. J. Res. 6) authorizing the Secretary of War to use \$50,000 of the appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, for the construction of a modern hospital at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the concurrent resolution of the Senate No. 11, to print 7,000 copies of the report of Maj. Gen. John R. Brooke, military governor of the island of Cuba.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for immediate use as a public document 11,000 copies of the proceedings in connection with the reception of the Webster statue on January 18, 1900, as reported by the committee of arrangements, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of Mr. Stilson Hutchins, 4,000 for the use of the Senate, and 6,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; also 10,000 copies in the form prescribed by law for printing eulogies, of which, in cloth binding, 1,000 shall be for the use of Mr. Hutchins, 3,000 delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, 2,000 for the use of the Senate, and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

- H. R. 947. An act to create a new division in the eastern judicial district of the State of Tennessee;
- H. R. 5491. An act to amend section 4843 of the Revised Statutes; and
- H. R. 5042. An act to provide for improvements in the tax departments of the District of Columbia.

#### CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the House has under consideration the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill. The slight changes in the items thereof have been so well explained by the chairman of the committee that I do not see that it is necessary to go further in that direction. But, Mr. Chairman, the thought arises whether we, as representatives of the people, in simply passing the appropriation bills for the different branches of our Government, perform our whole duty in not looking into the condition and state of them to see whether our appropriations are wisely bestowed and whether they are organized for the fullest efficiency and for the greatest degree of economy.

In appropriating the various items of the sum total for our consular service, should we not look into that branch, a most important one in the commercial relations of our country, and see what its organization is to-day, what are the principles upon which it is founded, and what is the efficiency of the personnel of that service? It strikes me that this would be a proper function to be performed by the representatives of the people in passing this annual appropriation bill, and I ask the attention of the committee for a short time while I call attention to the present organization and the conditions that exist in our consular service to-day.

It is a curious fact, Mr. Chairman, that with all the energy and push shown by the business men of our country in developing trade at home and their exports abroad, they have paid so little attention to this most important service which represents the best interests of our country in foreign lands. It is even a more curious fact that those who are intrusted with the government of our country, both the executive and the legislative branches, have paid but little attention to this important service from the foundation of the service by the act of 1780. Nothing was done in the whole history of our country to enlarge or improve the service until 1883, when a bill was passed taking away, to a large degree, the shipping fees which had grown to be such a sore in the service and brought it into such disrepute that it was found absolutely necessary to take some step in that direction. From that day to this there has been no practical legislation bearing upon this important service in our country.

Some of the consulates that were of great importance since that time, owing to changes in the trade, have become less so, and those that had no factor in the development of our trade practically, owing to geographical and political changes, have become some of the most important in the service. The compensation attaching to these various positions has not been changed, while the cost of living has greatly increased. The whole system of salaries in the service is hodgepodge, some increased here and there under diplomatic appropriation bills, but as a whole not founded on any idea of system or proper compensation for the amount of work done or the ability of the incumbent that holds the office.

Such changes in condition show the necessity for a careful revision of the salaries throughout the service. As an example of the incongruous condition which this detached legislation has imposed upon the service the following are cited:

The consulate at Nuremberg, Germany, a city of 160,000 inhabitants, has a salary of \$3,000, and the consulate at Fürth, but a few minutes distant by street car, has a salary of \$2,000.

On the other hand, the important consulates at Mannheim and Munich, the latter the capital of Bavaria, a city of 405,000 inhabitants and the residence of a large American colony, have a salary of only \$1,500 each.

The values of declared exports to the United States from the Mannheim district in 1894 were \$3,648,989; in 1895, \$3,875,538; and in 1896, \$3,468,261; while those from Nuremberg were, 1894, \$1,406,740; 1895, \$1,525,204; and in 1896, \$1,561,521.

The case at Kehl is even more striking, for the district of that consulate includes all of Lorraine and a large part of Alsace, where the cases of friction between the authorities and naturalized American citizens, natives of those provinces, are of constant occurrence and require on the part of the United States consul the exercise of firmness and diplomatic discretion, while the duties of the consul at Munich, with its large number of inhabitants, many of them being Americans, requires the assiduous and constant attention of the person occupying that position.

The recital of these facts assuredly shows the need of the revision in our consular service, and they could be amplified in every portion of the globe to which that service is extended.

Thus it will be seen that from a business standpoint the service to-day is in a most mixed and unsatisfactory condition. Let us

look at the organization of the service; let us see how the appointments are made, what qualifications are deemed necessary, and what is the tenure of office. I wish it distinctly understood that I am speaking absolutely from a nonpartisan standpoint. I do not attack the Administration of either political party. I hold that under the present system it is absolutely impossible for the Executive of our Republic or for any Senator or Representative, however earnest or highly qualified he may be, to stand up against the political pressure that is brought to bear to-day to secure political appointments in our consular service.

The advantage of a reorganization of our consular service has been called to the attention of Congress from time to time by those who saw the growing necessity for some legislation in that regard. The Department of State has long recognized the inadequacy of the consular service to the growing needs of the country and to the proper protection of the business and property of our citizens residing abroad, either for business or the pleasure of travel.

Secretary of State Livingston, in 1833, and Secretary of State Buchanan, in 1846, called attention to the evils existing in the service, but it was not until 1884, when Secretary of State Frelinghuysen discussed the subject in his admirable and exhaustive report transmitted to Congress by President Arthur March 20 of that year, that the strong necessity for action was made apparent. In it he said:

Until recently the demands of Europe, which consumed the greater portion of our exports, and the condition of the producing countries were such as to give us control in the supply of certain products, such as breadstuffs, provisions, cotton, and petroleum, etc. The demands of Europe for all these products and of the other continents for petroleum especially were so positive, and our producing conditions so favorable, as to give us practically a monopoly for their supply.

These conditions of international demand and supply are undergoing radical changes, which the near future will intensify.

The efforts which have been made and which are being made by Europe to enlarge the field of supply in the above-mentioned products, aided by the ambition which prevails in all countries for the development of natural and artificial resources to meet their own wants and to supply the wants of others, have resulted in awakening competition for the supply even of those products which we have heretofore controlled. It is true that thus far this competition has not affected our trade to any appreciable extent, but the desire for development which is now abroad and the ambition which prevails to increase the production (outside of the United States) of the foregoing articles render consular supervision of absolute importance. *The complex commercial relations and industrial interests which now prevail in Europe have originated hostility to American products in many countries and afford additional reasons for the enlargement and perfection of the consular service.*

The same necessity has been pressed upon the Government at home by our representatives in the service abroad. In 1864 John Bigelow, consul at Paris, wrote:

The practical results of our system, which in this respect has no parallel under any other government, are—

- (1) That we are obliged to select for consular posts men without the proper training and qualifications.
  - (2) We are obliged to select men who have no intention of making a career in the consular service. Consequently they have no great inducement to qualify themselves properly for a post which they can hope to hold only for a brief term by the acquisition of knowledge of little or no use to them in any other profession.
  - (3) The fact that our consuls are so transitory deprives them of their proper influence in the consular body, as well as in most political and social circles where it is the interest of the Government that they should circulate.
  - (4) Such frequent changes prevent anything like uniformity or regularity in the conduct of consular business, which results in a serious prejudice to commerce and a grave inconvenience to the Department.
  - (5) With each change of Administration the Government is exposed to lose the benefit of whatever knowledge and influence its agents have acquired during their terms of service, and thus most of the time is served by raw, and, therefore, to a considerable extent, by incompetent officers.
- There is no other country in the world where the tenure of the consular office is dependent upon the permanence of the home administration. Nor can the practice be defended by any consideration whatever which looks to its usefulness and efficiency.

Surely no stronger evidence could be adduced, coming from one of experience in the consular service.

The Hon. Robert Adams, jr., when United States minister to Brazil, in 1889, wrote in the *North American Review*:

The method by which the men are chosen for the positions necessarily brings forth poor candidates, while the short tenure of office, which is generally limited to the Presidential term, almost certainly so if a change of party takes place, and the meager salaries paid—in some posts hardly sufficient to support life in a respectable manner—deters competent men from entering the service. It should also be remembered that there is no promotion for efficient service; that a consul can not hope for a change of climate from a trying to a more healthful and genial one after a given period of service, and that there is always the prospect of returning to the United States broken down in health, unfitted to resume private business, and without prospect of further employment at the hands of the Government.

Assistant Secretary Rockhill, in an article in the *Forum* for the month of February, 1897, sums up the evils of our consular system as follows:

- (1) Imperfect mode of selection of consular officers.
- (2) No permanency of tenure.
- (3) Inadequate compensation, resulting in (a) the exaction of excessive fees and (b) the creation of consular agencies to increase salaries.
- (4) Excessive number of feed consulates and commercial agencies.
- (5) Imperfect enforcement of regulations, especially as regards amounts of fees and their collection.

This judgment from the late Assistant Secretary of State, who had especial charge of the consular service, is certainly deserving of great weight upon this subject.

It is proposed to place all grades of consuls under a salary and to do away with consular and commercial agencies, and provide that all fees of all kinds must be accounted for and covered into the United States Treasury. Of the advantages of this system over the present one abundant evidence is presented by those most conversant with the needs of the service. In 1871 Inspector Keim reported:

The act of 1856 was doubtless designed to correct the most conspicuous of the abuses which prevailed. \* \* \* The evils prior to that date may have been mitigated or may have suffered temporary abatement. \* \* \* They were certainly not eradicated; and these abuses \* \* \* have been perpetuated in most cases by each succeeding officer.

Again, in 1879, Gen. Julius Stahel, then consul at Hiogo, Japan, wrote to the Department of State:

The permission granted to consular officers of receiving unofficial fees for notarial acts, etc., is liable to abuse, and is the root of many evils and irregularities. \* \* \* I suggest that the permission to charge unofficial fees be withdrawn, and that all fees received by consular officers, for whatsoever service rendered, be considered as official, and so accounted for. \* \* \* In this way one of the greatest evils of our service would be remedied and dignity added to the representation of the United States in foreign countries.

Secretary Frelinghuysen, in his report of 1884 on the consular service, said:

In the opinion of the Department, the present system of compensation by fees, either official or unofficial, should be abolished. Whatever money comes into the consul's hands should be turned into the Treasury of the United States, and he should depend for his support entirely upon the salary allowed by Congress.

In 1885, writing on the same subject to the Department, Gen. John S. Mosby, consul at Hongkong, expressed himself even more emphatically:

Consular fees should, in my opinion, be altogether abolished. \* \* \* The best way to secure honesty in the public service is to make it impossible for officers to be dishonest. I can see no sound reason for sending consuls abroad to collect revenue for the Government. You might as well send the Navy to do it.

The personnel of the service has improved under the orders issued by President Cleveland and President Harrison, and which are being carried out by the present Executive. But that is only a step in the right direction; it is liable to be overturned at any time; it is transient in its nature, and the appointment is still a subject of political pressure.

What business man who wanted to choose a clerk in his business would allow some outside person to bring a candidate for that position and say, without regard to his fitness, "This man must be appointed," and to back that up with sufficient personal and political influence to force that person into the place? That is the present status of our consular service. To-day men are not appointed for their qualifications or their fitness; they are appointed under political pressure.

I know the feeling that exists among many members of this House against what is known as "civil-service reform." Now, I do not wish to be misunderstood in regard to my ideas on this subject. I know that many members of this House are loath to part with any patronage which they think may be of any assistance to them during their renomination. I would call the attention of such gentlemen to this fact in regard to appointments in the consular service: You may have three or four applicants in your district for appointment as consul to a particular place. In the distribution of patronage it is absolutely impossible, however great may be your influence, for you to get more than one person appointed in your district.

Now, my friends, what is the practical result of securing this appointment? The only gentleman whom you have favored and upon whose support you may think you can rely is sent out of the country, and the three gentlemen whom you have disappointed remain at home, each vowing vengeance in his heart—each ready to take the greatest satisfaction in preventing your return to Congress when you come up for renomination. And the one friend upon whom you thought you had the right to rely for support and aid will write to you that owing to the smallness of his compensation and the largeness of his family and expensiveness of the trip, however glad he would be to come home and give you that support which gratitude would indicate as his duty, he regrets that under the circumstances it will be utterly impossible for him to come back.

So I say that any member of this House who thinks that he is securing assistance in his political life or a continuance of his political position by controlling such appointments will, if he will look into the matter carefully, see that the sooner this sort of so-called "influence" is removed the more likely will be the continuance of his tenure in office and the retention of his seat.

Suppose, Mr. Chairman, that a good business man does receive one of these appointments. Suppose he is admirably fitted to report on the commercial necessities of the country to which he is accredited and to inform our people at home of what those countries have to sell to us or exchange with us in commerce. I acknowledge that the previous business experience may be of benefit to a consul. But suppose the appointee is simply a good American citizen who speaks only good "United States." Suppose he is sent, as he most likely will be, to a country where his



native language is scarcely spoken at all or scarcely understood. Can anyone maintain that after this man has been there four years and has acquired the language and has become able to read the newspapers and the trade reports and to inquire and report upon the needs of the country—what that country needs to buy and what it has to sell us—is there a business or professional man in this House who will contend that the system is founded on a sound principle which would bring that man home at the end of four years and send out another to go through the same course of schooling and to be also brought home when he has acquired sufficient knowledge to perform well the duties of the consulship? I think these facts are self-evident propositions that any man can realize.

Mr. Chairman, bills have been introduced into this House for the purpose of putting this whole service under a long tenure, conditioned upon passing examinations for the entering of the service, removals to be only on account of misbehavior or unfitness, with the service divided into classes, and promotions from one class to the other for diligence and ability. It is to these measures that for a few moments I invite the attention of the House, to improve the conditions which now exist.

Very few people, Mr. Chairman, realize the full functions of a consul while he is performing his duties abroad. If the House will bear with me, I will read briefly in order to impress upon them the importance of this branch of the service:

Consuls are appointed to reside abroad for the purpose of protecting, facilitating, and extending commerce between the countries which appoint them and the countries whither they are sent. Their functions, however, are not limited to commercial transactions. They stand as the protectors and advisers of their countrymen present in foreign lands; they act as judges, notaries, and administrators of interests and of all property of such as have no legal representative; they have to prevent frauds on the revenue; to notice infractions of treaty stipulations relating to trade; to advise their government of new laws or regulations within their districts; to preserve the discipline of the commercial marine; to guard seamen from oppression, and they are expected to aid the destitute, for which purpose no funds are available except their meager salary.

Consuls are also required to prepare from time to time reports upon matters affecting commercial, industrial, financial, and agricultural interests; regarding labor, rate of wages, hours of work, and the condition of working people. In preparing these reports they are to bear in mind that the principal purpose to be served is the extension and encouragement of American industry at home and of her commerce abroad. Certainly these are duties sufficiently arduous and numerous to require for their faithful performance all the intelligence, honor, and patriotism of the best citizens of the Republic.

Mr. Chairman, that is an extract from an article that I wrote as much as ten years ago for the North American Review. It was written in consequence of my personal observations in South America, whither I had been sent officially as United States minister to Brazil. I visited every consulate, from Para down to Buenos Ayres, on the west coast. I do not wish to refer personally to the conditions I found there, for, as I have already stated, it is the system to which I wish to call attention, and not the personnel, because, until the system is changed, it is beyond the power of man to entirely change the conditions.

A consul at the present time has no incentive to work. Why should a man who is sent to a bad climate, who knows that at the end of four years, even if his own political party remains in power, he will be called home in order that some other man may be rewarded? What incentive has that man in a tropical climate to arouse his energy to work to the full measure of his ability?

Under these bills which have been introduced—and one of which I hope will be reported for submission to this House—the service is divided into classes, and a man can be promoted from one to the other by the State Department under direction of the President. Not only that, but make this a long-tenure service and you will find that young men in our country, the same as they do in others, will fit themselves for this profession and enter it as a livelihood. They would not be warranted under present conditions in expending the time and money necessary to take a two years' course or even a shorter time. That amount of capital would not be warranted to be invested unless a young man felt that he had a life service or a long-tenure service before him. The universities are already inquiring. I have had communications from two colleges this winter asking if it would be possible, if this bill were to pass, that they could institute special courses in the universities to prepare young men for this service.

Our consuls should be trained for their positions and pass an examination on such subjects as the laws regulating shipping, the commercial treaties existing between their own and other countries, the laws relating to intestates, on the consular regulations of the United States, and on such other subjects as relate to their duties. They should also be required to have a practical knowledge of French or of the language of the country to which they are to be sent. It will be demanded, "Where will such a specially educated class come from?" Once it is understood that the service is a permanent one, young men will prepare for it the same as they do for other professions, and in sufficient numbers to arouse competition. That this was not a matter of conjecture was fully established by the experience in Great Britain when the examination for the civil service was thrown open to all, the num-

ber of applicants having increased the first year from 5,000 to 15,000 and the character and ability of the applicants having proved as high as if not better than that of the selected applicants had been before.

To insure this, however, the salaries must be raised. How can a man be expected to live at Para, in Brazil, under an equatorial sun, exposed to malarial and yellow fevers, and deprived almost entirely of all social intercourse, for \$2,000 a year; or, even worse, at Santos, where the town was decimated by yellow fever, the victims including the United States vice-consul? Yet the importance of the first position to our country can best be stated by the value of the exports to the United States, which amount annually to \$7,000,000, while the annual export of coffee alone from the second port to our country is \$30,000,000. These cases could be amplified, but they are sufficient to illustrate the present state of affairs.

Nowhere is the adage "The best is the cheapest" more forcibly illustrated than in the consular service. Had it been composed of the proper material, no necessity could have arisen for the establishment of the South American Bureau or of sending special commissioners to the foreign governments to make arrangements for the exhibits at the Columbian Exposition.

Mr. Chairman, I am an American in my love for my country and in my belief in its institutions, but I am not so wrapped up in patriotism that I do not think our Republic, which is young compared with the other nations of the world, can not learn from other countries. We are the only civilized nation to-day that allows this important branch of its service to be run on haphazard appointments and without proper control. England, France, Germany, Russia, Italy, Turkey, every country has this service organized in such a way that men can become acquainted with their duties and can make more efficient reports. As trade expands and commerce becomes more complicated and competition becomes more keen, the necessity that our merchants should have the most accurate information gathered by trained men who know just what is required, and not gathered haphazard, with an energy that may be commendable but which is not advisable, all this becomes more important for those at home. All the countries which I have mentioned have a service in which men are promoted for their ability and their efficiency from one post to another.

It has been advanced that some of our consuls make admirable reports. I acknowledge that fact with great pleasure, Mr. Chairman, and those gentlemen deserve all credit for their loyalty and devotion to their country, but those men and those reports are accidents and do not come as the result of a principle. These men were appointed at the suggestion of some one, but for every good man who is appointed it is just as likely, under the present system, that a bad one may come next. There is no regulation or organization of the system.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I contend is that this great service of our country, which represents its business and commercial interests, should be founded on principle, so that every appointee should be qualified for the place, so that every man who does his duty and makes good reports will be assured of promotion, and every man who is sent to an undesirable post with an almost deadly climate may at least live in the hope that if he arouses his energies in that enervating atmosphere and performs his duties with credit, in a short space of time he may receive promotion and be moved up in the service.

In conclusion, without going into the political question which has been raised by my distinguished colleague from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], I will simply take the physical fact that our country is about to expand territorially. Just so surely as that takes place, it must expand commercially. The energy and the enterprise of the American people will not allow any opportunity to pass where they can add to the wealth and industry and employ the labor of our great country.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the possession of the Philippine Islands is a mere stepping-stone to the great trade for which all Europe is grasping in China and the East. Whatever advantages they may offer, of themselves, sink into insignificance compared to the trade that is going to open to the civilized nations of the world with the 400,000,000 people, semicivilized at least, who taunt us with our civilization, for they think theirs is much older, but who are certainly civilized sufficiently to use our goods, to employ our machinery, to market our electrical appliances and railroad supplies and other such commodities which our country exports. Surely we must have reliable information from these regions if we wish to secure their trade. Surely we should have men there who are specially prepared to report what is necessary.

Just to illustrate how perfectly useless a haphazard citizen would be to send as consul to China, on Saturday it was my privilege to accompany the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee to an institution in Philadelphia, which is established to expand our export trade; and one of the most curious things submitted to that committee was a report from China, with a great number of illustrations of the stamps to be put on the covers of the goods to be

sent there. For if you impugn or slight in any degree the religion or any of the traditions of China by any labels that you put on the goods, or any design in the patterns that go there, you might as well take those goods and burn them up in a bonfire. This is one illustration, Mr. Chairman, that relates to the cotton goods to supply 400,000,000 people. I do not think any consul, unless he had previous training and had had his attention called to the subject, would be likely to learn this one thing until he had resided in China some time; and even then, if he had the incentive of longevity, I question if he would have the time, the trouble, to report that to his own government.

Mr. Chairman, this opportunity that is now coming before our country for the extension of our trade and commerce is one of the principal reasons why I press this question upon the House and why I urged this legislation before the Committee on Foreign Affairs, which I think should induce the committee to report one of the bills that has been submitted to it. The measure has the entire support of the business community. The National Board of Trade, assembled in Washington only last week, is unanimously indorsing the principle of this bill. The boards of trade of Chicago, Cleveland, New York, and Philadelphia sent deputations to appear before our committee to urge the passage of some such measure as this; and I have taken this opportunity to call the attention of the House to the question, hoping to arouse general interest in this great question, which will tend as much to the development of the prosperity of our country as any measure that will come before it this session of Congress.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a correspondent of the London Times once wrote to that paper stating that he sent it a long letter because he did not have time enough to prepare a short one. That was a very philosophic remark. I, perhaps, will speak longer to-day than if I had had time to write out a speech on the Philippine question, to which I propose to devote myself exclusively. In order that there may be no question whatever about what I think upon this subject, I propose to begin with a few plain propositions which I intend to discuss.

A man does not have to be an idiot in order to be a patriot. A man is not a traitor because he is opposed to doing those things which jeopardize the existence of this Republic.

An American is not a pessimist because he is unwilling to see his country adopt as a settled creed the political principles of Alexander, Cæsar, or Napoleon.

In the hands of political jobbers the American flag, like the mantle of charity, will be made to cover a multitude of sins. I do not care a baubee about Aguinaldo or the Philippines. My sympathy, my heart, my solicitude, goes out to the American people. I think more, far more, of the liberties of my children than of all the trade of all the earth. I would like to leave them both rich and free, but of the two I would infinitely prefer to leave them free—free to labor, free to work out their own destiny, free to sympathize with and help all people everywhere struggling for liberty. I would not give the life of one healthy, honest, moral, patriotic, ambitious American white boy in exchange for all the Philippines [applause] now in the archipelago or who will be there until the great judgment day. Believing firmly—and I will answer your question, my good friend—

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Thank you.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Believing firmly that the annexation of the Philippines, either forcibly or with the consent of the people of those islands, will in the end prove dangerous, if not ruinous, to our "government of the people, by the people, and for the people," I am dead against it now, henceforth, and forever. I would be against annexing them if every man, woman, and child in the Philippine Islands stood beseeching us to annex them.

Crimination and recrimination are not ideal methods of ascertaining truth or of discovering either the path of duty or the best interests of ourselves and of our posterity.

It must be taken for granted that every citizen of the Republic worthy of his birthright of freedom is heartily in favor of perpetuating our representative Government.

No more important question was ever before the American Congress than the one which now confronts us of determining our relations to the Philippine Islands. Upon its solution depend our own prosperity and happiness no less than the happiness and prosperity of the Philippines. For its consideration and determination I invoke the patient study, careful investigation, deliberate judgment, and purest patriotism of every man upon this floor.

What has been done and said is not of as much consequence as what will hereafter be done and said. Thus far propositions offered and theories advanced have been tentative in their character. In military parlance, divers and sundry gentlemen, from the President down to the junior Senator from Indiana, have been "feeling the position," listening for the vox populi, and trying, let us hope, all of them, to learn what is right and what is best for us to do in the position of indubitable difficulty in which we find ourselves.

But the time is coming, and it is coming rapidly, when we must adopt a permanent policy that we are willing to stand or to fall by.

Mr. Chairman, it looks as if we had the Philippine Islands

in theory. We have them not in fact. It was first said that we had them by conquest; but the President gives up that proposition, if he ever held it. Judge Day, who was at the head of the Peace Commission, says: "If we have any claim over there, it is a right by purchase and not by conquest." Now, what are we doing? I invite your attention, and, if need be your questions, because, as this is not a written, cast-iron, prepared speech, it admits of elasticity; and I am not sure but what we shall arrive at a wise and righteous conclusion a great deal sooner by questioning each other than by making set speeches.

Section 10 of the treaty of Paris provides—

That the civil rights and political status of the native inhabitants of the territories hereby ceded to the United States shall be determined by the Congress.

The phrase "the territories hereby ceded" means the Philippines.

Nearly fourteen months have gone to join the years before the flood since that treaty was signed—to-morrow will be the anniversary of its ratification by the Senate—yet Congress has done nothing, absolutely nothing, has not even attempted to do anything, toward carrying out that provision of the treaty to "determine the civil rights and political status" of those far-away and unhappy islanders.

The status of the Philippines and the rights of Americans are left, like Mohammed's coffin, suspended between heaven and earth.

After that treaty was ratified by the Senate, imitating the example of the man who locked the barn after the horse was gone, that body passed a resolution by way of construing the treaty, in which it declares "that by the ratification of the treaty of peace with Spain it is not intended to incorporate the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands into citizenship of the United States, nor is it intended to permanently annex said islands as an integral part of the territory of the United States."

That is what the Senate said, but the Senate is not the Congress; and as at least one-half of the Senators have expressed opinions diametrically opposed to that resolution, and as the President of the United States, in his stumping tour through the West in 1898, which changed what would have been a democratic majority into a Republican majority [applause on the Republican side]—the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. LACY] does well to applaud, because he would not have been in this Congress if it had not been for Mr. McKinley's speeches [laughter]—as on that tour the President rejected that theory, it must be taken for granted that the Congress does not indorse it.

Now, the primary question is—and I press it home upon your minds and consciences—Does Congress intend to abdicate its functions or not? That is what we have done so far. In the last Congress we frequently inquired what was the policy of the White House, what the policy of the Republican party was. No man on that side of the Chamber ever undertook to say what it was; occasionally and only occasionally one would say what his own theory was. But I wish to repeat that question: Does Congress intend to legislate under the tenth section of the treaty of Paris, as it is in duty bound to do, or does it intend to abdicate its constitutional function and permit the President to run things ad libitum in the Philippines by means of a military satrapy? Judging the future by the past, all that Congress is expected to do in this matter of such far-reaching consequence to the American people is to furnish the money to carry on the government by satraps and to keep up a war which Congress never authorized and which Congress and Congress alone had the constitutional power to authorize. How long is this extraordinary state of affairs to continue? Is it to be continued only till after the election in order to give Republicans a chance to repudiate any particular policy and to advocate the one that appears to be most popular, or is it, like Tennyson's brook, to go on forever?

These questions are not asked for amusement or aggravation, but because the people of America have a right to the information.

Indeed, on several occasions, when, in the other end of the Capitol, gentlemen have offered resolutions of inquiry, the resolutions have been tabled and the patriotism of the authors impugned.

In the days of reconstruction Congress usurped Executive functions until the office of the President of the United States was reduced almost to a nullity. Now the President of the United States usurps legislative functions until Congress has fallen to the low estate of being merely an animated cash register for the executive department of this Government. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Which do you like the best?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not like either one. I like for the executive department to attend strictly to its own business, for the legislative department to attend to its business strictly, and for the judicial department to attend to its business strictly, and not undertake to run the politics of this country by issuing an injunction at every full or change of the moon. [Laughter.]

There was a day when the rescripts of the Roman emperors were supposed to be of binding effect throughout their vast domain. It really appears that we are fast sinking to a position



when the wish of the President and not the Constitution is the supreme law of the land.

The Spanish war, which Congress declared, really ended in July, 1898; technically it ended with the ratification of the treaty of Paris.

The Philippine war, which Congress never declared, began about the time the Spanish war closed, is still raging, and the end thereof is not even in sight.

One day we are informed by General Otis, our viceroy in Asia, that Aguinaldo is cornered and about to be captured at some distant point; the next day Aguinaldo is fighting within hearing of Manila.

This game of military hide and seek has been played for about a year at a cost to the people of thousands of valuable American lives and of over one hundred millions in hard cash.

The mothers and fathers of the country who are called upon to sacrifice their sons, the overburdened taxpayers who foot the bills, are beginning to exclaim, "How long, O Lord, how long?"

The Spanish war—the war authorized by Congress—added to our renown by the splendid victories of our forces by land and sea and gave us at least two new naval heroes of the first rank—George Dewey and Winfield Scott Schley.

But no man who has any reputation for veracity to lose will assert that the Philippine war has added to either our glory as a people or to the strength of the Republic.

When the Spanish war closed we could have occupied the most enviable position ever held by any nation since creation's dawn, and all we had to do was to do that which we owed it to ourselves to do, and that was to say to both the Cubans and the Philipinos, "The Spaniards are beaten; your chains are broken; you helped us to do this thing; now set up any sort of government you want, and we will make the other nations of the earth keep their hands off of you or we will shoot them off." [Applause.]

We would never have been compelled to fire a gun to make that promise good, for there is not a nation on earth that has any desire to see the fleets of Dewey and of Schley riding triumphantly in their harbors and shelling their seaport cities.

Had we done that, unstinted praises of our disinterestedness and philanthropy would have rung round the world, coupled with the amazing story of American valor and the prowess of Americans in arms. Wherever Old Glory floated it would have been hailed by millions of loving hearts in every quarter of the globe as the emblem of a people who are free themselves and who are willing and anxious that all men everywhere shall be free.

Now, on the principle that a fellow-feeling makes the whole world kin, the crowned and sceptered despots of Europe say to us: "All hail! We welcome you to membership in the ancient and sordid society of land grabbers. As you are the youngest and the strongest, we will give you the largest, choicest, and juiciest slice in partitioning the face of the globe among ourselves. We are in high good humor with you because you have eschewed the pestiferous principles of the Declaration of Independence, the cobweb restrictions of the Constitution, the preposterous sentiments of Washington's Farewell Address, the decisions of the Supreme Court for a century, the presumptuous doctrine of James Monroe, and the solemn advice of Abraham Lincoln. Those men and those principles were well enough in a crude age and among a backwoods people, but this is the last year of the nineteenth century—if not the first of the twentieth—and we will go land hunting, gold hunting, diamond hunting, and man hunting together. As a special favor we will give you all the entangling alliances you want for the rest of your lives, beginning with the Anglo-American alliance."

Just here I desire to make a few remarks upon another question, which is edged in here once in a while. It has been stated upon the floor of this House repeatedly by several Republican members, and it has been hinted at once or twice on this side of the House, that no party can succeed that is merely a party of negation. Now, that sounds very well—that no party will amount to anything that is simply an anti-party. That sounds very well, too. I do not know how much attention you gentlemen have paid to political nomenclature, but I state, without fear of successful contradiction, that no party in this country has ever amounted to anything that did not start out with the word anti prefixed to its name, and it grows out of the very nature of things. The robust party, the party of opposition, must in the very exigencies of the case fight a good many of the theories of the majority.

Let us see if that proposition is not true. The Democratic party as it exists to-day was first called the anti-Federalist party. It won its first great victory by turning John Adams and the Federalists out of this Government under the name of anti-Federalists. Now, if some of these doctrinaires, including my brother from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY], who is not now in his seat, had been living in that day and generation, they would with sublime effrontery have said to Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and Albert Gallatin, "Why, you do not know what you are doing, to call yourselves an anti-Federalist party." After they got in they changed the name of the party by a natural evolution to Republican party; then when

the revolution came, which brought on the "era of good feeling"—which was the worst period of American personal politics—we took, under Jackson, the name of Democratic party, which we hold to this day.

Now, how about you Republicans? You started out as the anti-slavery party, and all the victories that you ever won for which history will give you any credit you achieved as the anti-slavery party. You afterwards changed the name to the Republican party. As applied to our institutions, the phrase "Republican party" means absolutely nothing, and the phrase "Democratic party" means absolutely nothing. A Republican is a man that is in favor of representative government; and we all claim to be in favor of that. A democracy is a country where all the people get together and make their own laws, a thing which can only happen in a very small community, like the republics of Greece.

An anti-imperialist of to-day is a man who is in favor of preserving the Republic and is against establishing an empire under the American flag in Asia or elsewhere.

An anti-trust man is one who believes the Ten Commandments, particularly the one which says, "Thou shalt not steal," who believes in giving every person an equal chance and who believes that competition is the life of trade.

An anti-gold-standard man is one who believes in the money of the Constitution—both silver and gold. And so on to the end of the chapter. So let us hear no more cant about a mere party of negation. We are for everything that is right and "anti" as to everything wrong.

But to return to our mutton. What are we going to do about the Philippines? What is it our duty to do? What have we a right to do? Under the Constitution and the decisions of the Supreme Court we must either refuse to take the Philippines and to hold them permanently or we must admit them as States. There is no escape from that proposition if we are to pay any attention to the highest judicial authority.

It is with the greatest diffidence that I quote the Supreme Court of the United States or any judge thereof. My observation is that everyone admires the Supreme Court and adores it when it has decided his way; and when it decides against him, he reserves to himself the right to go outside and "cuss" the Court. Very much depends on whose ox is gored.

The other day my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] who sits in front of me and who honors me by his attention, put in a great deal of his time apotheosizing Judge Story, of the Supreme Court of the United States. I do not object to that. Judge Story deserves well at the hands of posterity. But I am going to quote you another judge of the Supreme Court of the United States—John Marshall—for nearly thirty-five years Chief Justice of the United States. I am not enamored of Marshall's politics; he was the rankest Federalist that ever lived; but this tribute is due to him—that he was the greatest jurist that ever sat on that bench; and Judge Story compared with Marshall "is as moonlight unto sunlight, or as water unto wine." Here is what Chief Justice Marshall says in one case:

The Government of the United States can claim no powers which are not granted to it by the Constitution, and the powers actually granted must be such as are expressly given or given by necessary implication.

Now, please bear in mind who John Marshall was. He was not only Chief Justice, but he was the chief of Federalists. He resolved every doubt in favor of the General Government. But those were his words, and surely Republicans ought to accept them as sufficient. Remember also that he is defining the powers and scope of the Federal Government under the Constitution. We are, or ought to be, at this very hour trying with all the lights before us to ascertain our powers and our rights in dealing with the Philippine Islands under the Constitution.

Again the Supreme Court says:

A power in the General Government to obtain and hold colonies as dependent Territories over which they (the Congress) might legislate without restriction would be inconsistent with its own existence in its present form.

Those be pertinent words.

Then in another case:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred; and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States of the Union.

I want to read that to you again, because upon that proposition turns this whole question. The paramount problem to us and our posterity is, What are we going to do with the Philippines if we get them? I have no doubt about our getting them if we want them, though we have not got them yet; but, as I stated once before upon the floor of this House, in fighting the annexation of the Sandwich Islands, this Government is strong enough to do what it pleases with the nations of the earth; and if we want to, we can take the islands; never fear about that.

But I want to read you that proposition again. This is a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now, no Republican or "Goldbug" can afford to say that he is not going to be governed by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, because

in 1896 you denounced us all over this land as anarchists because we proposed to do the very same thing that the Republican party had done with the Supreme Court of the United States; that was to reorganize it so that we could get the kind of decision out of it that we wanted. And as for myself, I unhesitatingly say that if I had the power I would reorganize it.

But I will read the proposition again, for you are nearly all lawyers:

The power of Congress over the Territories is limited by the obvious purposes for which it was conferred; and those purposes are satisfied by measures which prepare the people of the Territories to become States of the Union.

Now, I desire to submit this to you while you are cool, while this has not yet become a party question. It is becoming one; but it has not become one yet. Is any man on this floor willing to say that the Philippine Islands shall ever become States of the American Union? I challenge the array on the other side of the House individually for any man there to get up and state that he is in favor of making American States out of the Philippine Islands, either now or hereafter. I pause for a reply.

I will tell you what I think about the Philippines. One of two things is true about them—either they are fit for self-government or they are not. If they are, in God's name let them govern themselves. If they are not, we do not want them as fellow-citizens.

I will tell you another thing I believe I know about them. No matter whether they are fit to govern themselves or not, they are not fit to govern us [applause], and that is precisely what they will do if we let them in as States.

Do you know when they will come in as States? I will not tell you the date. I am not prophet enough for that; but I will tell you the conditions under which they will come, and the day that they are admitted to the Union the American Union is dead as the mammoths that lived in the glacial period. It may take the Republic a thousand years to die, as it took Rome, but die she will if we admit the Philippine Islands as States, and they will be admitted as States into the American Union—now listen, because this is not a Democratic propaganda—they will be admitted whenever the President of the United States and the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives are all of the same political party, when a Presidential election is coming on, and the party in power—it does not make a bit of difference which party it is—thinks it needs a few more rotten-borough electoral votes. When those conditions exist at the same time, in they will come.

Now, some people grow very virtuous. I understand that. And they say that no State has ever been admitted for political effect. The man who says that either does not understand the history of his country or he states what he knows is not true. How did Maine get into the Union? It came in to balance Missouri, imperial Missouri.

Mr. LACEY. Are you getting to be an imperialist?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I am not an imperialist. I live in an imperial Commonwealth. How did Florida get into the Union? To balance Iowa. How did Nevada come into the sisterhood of States? Because the Republicans thought they needed another State to ratify the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments. How did that bunch of Rocky Mountain States get in here? For two reasons: Benjamin Harrison had an ambition that more States should be admitted during his Presidency than were ever admitted in the Presidency of anybody else; but chiefly because the men then in Congress believed that those States would vote the Republican ticket early, often, and late.

Now, let us see what the Supreme Court says a little further—it is mighty good reading when it is your way:

The Territories acquired by Congress, whether by deed of cession from the original States or by treaty with a foreign country, are held with the object, as soon as their population and condition justify it, of being admitted into the Union as States, upon an equal footing with the original States in all respects.

There you have it. Now, the Philippine Islands have one of the two qualifications. They have the population. Nobody knows how many islands there are. There is not a man in the House or on the earth, except by accident, who can guess within five hundred of the number of the Philippine Islands. Even MARK HANNA can not do it, nor General GROSVENOR, who knows nearly everything. [Laughter.] There is not a man in the United States or on the face of the earth who can tell within 5,000,000 of the number of people there are in these islands. But if you take the lowest estimate, 8,000,000 people, how many States would that make in the American Union equal to the population of Nevada, which at the last election only cast about 9,000 votes and at the Presidential election 12,000? Why, it beggars the imagination to think of the number of almond-eyed, brown-skinned, Mohammedan United States Senators who would sit over there to kill the vote of Gen. FRANCIS MARION COCKRELL, senior and perpetual Senator from the State of Missouri, and those other illustrious conscript fathers.

Now, you gentlemen must look out for breakers. The truth is, the more you study it the less you are going to be in favor of taking those islands in at all. The more the American people think

about it the less stomach they are going to have for seeing the liberties of their children imperiled by people who go naked, sleep outdoors, and make their living by eating breadfruit off the trees. Let us read some more; it is good when it is with you.

The Supreme Court says:

The Constitution was made for the benefit of every citizen of the United States, and there is no citizen, whatever his condition, or wherever he may be within the territory of the United States, who has not a right to its protection.

Now, our Ways and Means Committee—of course I would not say anything disrespectful of that august body, which contains several of the most distinguished statesmen in this House—that committee have been studying what? Politics? No. Finance? No. Political economy? No. Studying lexicography, to find out what constitutes the United States. I am not authorized to speak for that committee, but I understand that they are about to run foul of Brother McKinley's opinion in their definition of what constitutes the United States.

Let me read to you some more from the opinion of the United States Supreme Court:

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories—

It does not help it to call them colonies, for that is a mere subterfuge; that is a piece of legislative legerdemain to undertake to escape a great and grave responsibility to ourselves and our posterity by trying to hide behind the word "colony"—

The personal and civil rights of the inhabitants of the Territories are secured to them as to other citizens by the principles of constitutional liberty, which restrain all agencies of the Government, State and national.

Oh, yes; but these statesmen say they are not going to let the Filipinos come over here. "No, bless your soul; they shall not come." No man who is fit to sit on the Supreme Bench or the circuit bench of the United States or the bench of a State court would tolerate that cheap demagoguery for half a minute. Thank God that the American citizen, black or white, brown or copper colored, male or female, has the right, under the Stars and Stripes, to go wherever he pleases within the broad confines of this Republic without asking the consent of any power or getting a pass from the President of the United States. As quick as you make them American citizens, they can come here and drive our white men out of their positions into starvation; and really the men who are back of this propaganda are in favor of doing that very thing. I want to read you a little more. Here is what Judge Cooley says:

And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom, and to receive them into the Union, must follow, of course.

Now, it will not do to say that Judge Cooley is "an old fool," not while the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD] is an honored member of this House and while the Roberts case concerns the intelligence of mankind. Listen to Cooley again:

Does this term designate the whole or any particular portion of the American empire? Certainly this question can admit of but one answer. It is the name given to our great Republic, which is composed of States and Territories. The District of Columbia or the territory west of the Missouri is not less within the United States than Maryland or Pennsylvania.

And when territory is acquired, the right to suffer States to be formed therefrom, and to receive them into the Union, must follow, of course, not only because the Constitution confers the power to admit new States without restriction, but because it would be inconsistent with institutions founded on the fundamental idea of self-government that the Federal Government should retain territory under its imperial rule and deny the people the customary local institutions.

Gentlemen, if there ever was a legal proposition proved in this world by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, that string of decisions, and others which might be cited, demonstrate that we can not take the Philippine Islands unless we intend ultimately to make States out of them; or unless you intend to go back to your old doctrine of 1855 and '6 and '7 and '8, and propose to reorganize the Supreme Court of the United States and pack it, as you did in 1868 and '9 to get the legal-tender decisions.

Now, I want to ask it again. I am not making this speech for fun, nor for my health, nor as an oratorical exercise. I am discharging a solemn duty to my country and my kind. I am trying, if possible, to invoke the best thought of this House on all sides of this Chamber on the most momentous proposition that has been discussed within these walls since Sumner was fired on in the spring of 1861. It is more momentous than that, because if the Southern Confederacy had succeeded liberty would not have been dead. There would have been two republics on this continent instead of one. But if we take these Filipinos into partnership with us, then the knell of American liberty is sounded.

On the President's policy, so far as it has been revealed in its nebulousness, the American people are divided into three parts: Those who really indorse it because they believe it will add to the glory and wealth of the Republic; those who oppose it tooth and nail on grounds of highest patriotism and broadest humanity, because they believe that it will be dangerous, perhaps ruinous, to the Republic; those who deem it wrong and hazardous, but say, "We must support the President's policy, right or wrong."

A lover of "government of the people, by the people, and for



the people" may respect the first class; he must respect the second class, and he must heartily despise the third class.

The proposition that we must support the President's Philippine policy—whatever that may be—right or wrong, is the veriest rot, an insult to intelligence, a shame upon manhood, a tale told by an idiot, a betrayal of the principle of self-government.

I am willing to go as far as anyone in patriotism. I will support the country in any emergency; but President McKinley is not the country. The time has not yet come—I pray Almighty God that it may never arise—when the American people will accept the arrogant dictum of Louis XIV, when repeated by an American President, "I am the State!"

If President McKinley is at all worthy of his high position, he must entertain a supreme contempt for those political invertebrates, particularly for those claiming to be Democrats, who, in order to catch the crumbs falling from their master's table [applause], go about saying, "The President is wrong in his Philippine policy, but we must support the President." Out upon such cringing sycophancy!

Suppose a case. Suppose that when George III undertook to force our forefathers to pay the stamp tax, Patrick Henry, instead of delivering that great lyric speech before the Virginia house of burgesses, which precipitated the Revolution and which still thrills the heart like strains of martial music, had risen in his place and, cooing gently as a sucking dove, had said, "His Most Gracious Majesty is wrong about this stamp tax, but we must, as loyal subjects, support him, right or wrong." And suppose Washington, Jefferson, Greene, Warren, Lee, Putnam, Hamilton, Franklin, and all that glorious host of warriors and statesmen had weakly agreed to that. What would we be to-day? Instead of being the strongest, the richest, the most beneficent Republic that the sun ever looked down upon, we would still be English colonies, ruled by British proconsuls, without any voice whatsoever in the Government under which we live.

Those immortal state builders had been reared on the pleasant fiction that "the King can do no wrong," but when he did do wrong they boldly and iconoclastically trampled that preposterous falsehood in the dust and, wresting a continent from his iron grasp, made it the home of liberty and dedicated it to the twin propositions, "All men are created equal" and "Governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed." There were men in the land in 1776. Are there only manikins now? I do not believe such a monstrous libel on 75,000,000 American citizens. George III did wrong. Our fathers fought and conquered him. William McKinley does wrong. We will oppose and overthrow him under the forms of law. [Applause.]

I wish to make another suggestion along this line of letting these Philipinos in here. Now, Mr. Chairman, this startling proposition presents itself. Ten millions of Asiatics, not one of whom is fit to be an American citizen or to be made an American citizen—because that is what they will be—and have all the rights and privileges of American citizens! They can live on 15 cents a day from habit as well as we can on a dollar a day. Under the tutelage of skillful American teachers they will soon be as competent to use American machinery as our own mechanics, and the result of the whole thing is that American laborers, white and black, are to be brought into competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, which you gentlemen have talked about so long, without a single, solitary compensatory benefit from the theory of free trade.

Now, think about it on the grounds of humanity. We are told that we have commissioned ourselves as a lot of Don Quixotes to go forth into the world in quest of ventures, and that our duty is to carry the blessings of liberty and settled government to the ends of the earth. I deny it. Our duty is to attend to our own business, to secure the blessings of liberty to our posterity.

Now, let us see if we are fit to go into the political missionary business, and on this I challenge your attention. I am going to state facts that are within the common knowledge of all the people here. I ask you reformers over there, are we, the American people, in condition to go into the world as missionaries to carry the blessings of liberty and settled government to all other peoples? My friend from Pennsylvania quoted Scripture the other day, I understand—I was not here; I am sorry I was not—in favor of the imperial doctrine. Why, the devil quoted Scripture on a celebrated occasion in favor of his proposition. [Laughter.]

I will quote you a bit of Scripture that fits it like a glove: "Let every man set his own household in order before he goes to meddling with the households of other people." [Laughter.] Also, "Physician, heal thyself." What kind of a condition are we in to do missionary work? Let us see what we are doing right now. Hanging "niggers" in Mississippi, burning "niggers" in Kentucky, hanging Italians in Louisiana, a double-headed government in Kentucky, one governor assassinated and two living, two governments and two legislatures, and they can not hold a court in some parts of the State, my native State, without calling the militia. Out in Illinois one Sunday evening last summer they had

a battle in which more men were killed—and by a strange concatenation of events every one of them had a black hide—more men were killed than at the battle of Palo Alto or Resaca de la Palma.

Out in Idaho the State is under martial law. Up in Maine, the home of civilization and patriotism and learning, last summer they mobbed two preachers, tarred and feathered them, and rode them on a rail because they preached the doctrine of Jesus Christ. [Laughter.] The Washington Post—I wish I had the editorial here—stated that they would have burned them, but the lucifers would not work well. [Laughter.] Thank God, the lucifers were out of fix, or in the closing days of the nineteenth century, in the State of Maine, we should have had two humble followers of the Saviour burned alive because they preached the doctrine of the lowly Nazarene.

Last summer a mob with fury in its eye, murder in its heart, and a rope in its hand, chased a colored man and brother through the woods in Connecticut, the land of steady habits, but whether they ever found him or not I don't know; he has never been heard of since. [Laughter.] What must Charles Sumner, Harriet Beecher Stowe, William Lloyd Garrison, and other departed and distinguished philanthropists think of that, if they think at all amidst their present environments? [Laughter.] A year or two ago they hanged five men on one tree in one night in Indiana, and it was not a very good night for Judge Lynch, either.

Let us take another instance. All last summer the United States courts in this country were run overtime, and all of the judges were liable to be stricken down with nervous prostration, and what were they doing? Busy issuing injunctions at the command of the plutocrats of the land against men exercising the God-given right of earning their bread in the sweat of their faces.

Let us come east a little. If what John Wanamaker says about Matthew Stanley Quay is correct, Quay ought to be in the penitentiary the rest of his natural life [laughter]; and if what he says is not true, Wanamaker is the greatest liar since the days of Ananias and Sapphira. [Laughter.] Perhaps they are both correct. [Laughter.] I will not undertake to decide such a delicate question of Republican morals and Republican etiquette. [Renewed laughter.] The city of Philadelphia, whence my distinguished friend, brother ADAMS, comes, has become so corrupt that, notwithstanding it had 100,000 Republican majority at the last election, it imported ballot-box stuffers and repeaters from the city of Washington merely from the force of habit. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. I want to say to the gentleman from Missouri that the bad people from Washington came up there and led us astray. [Laughter.]

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no; that is like the sheep biting the wolf. [Laughter.] Old Dr. Johnson, the author of the English dictionary—and I commend him to the Ways and Means Committee in their struggle to find out what the words "United States" mean [laughter]—old Dr. Johnson, the Ursa Major of English literature, is said to have gone to see one widow every night for twenty years, and finally somebody said to him, "Why don't you marry her, Doctor?" He replied, "My dear sir, if I married her, where would I go to spend my evenings?" Force of habit. Just like the Philadelphia stuffing of ballot boxes. They say it is an absolute fact that that Republican city is so corrupt that when the man in the moon passes over it he holds his nose to keep from fainting. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I should like the gentleman to know that one lot of those ballot-box stuffers are in jail and every one of the others has skipped his bail, which has been forfeited; so that when the gentleman refers to the moral condition of Philadelphia, I want him to understand that the people there are still ready to see that what is right is done and that the men who break the laws are punished.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If all the ballot-box stuffers and heelers in Philadelphia were sent to the penitentiary the town would be depopulated. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Perhaps some of our ballot-box stuffers went to Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is not a State in the American Union that has a better election law than the State of Missouri. I drew it myself; I helped pass it through the legislature. In that imperial Commonwealth every man, black or white, rich or poor, votes once and has his vote counted once.

Mr. ADAMS. Yet we had a gentleman rise in his seat the other day and state that the election law in Missouri was such that it would be impossible to hold an honest election there. Did the gentleman from Missouri draw and pass that law?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. There is no such law. I will state what is the matter with the gentleman from St. Louis.

Mr. ADAMS. He is all right.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a moment. The gentleman from Missouri represents a large German constituency.

Mr. ADAMS. That is good.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. They are in favor of the Boers and

against the Philippine propaganda. The gentleman from Missouri has been running with the McKinley Administration until his political fences have got into very bad order, and he thought he would recoup by getting up here and making a spread-eagle speech about the corruption of elections in St. Louis.

Mr. BARTHOLDT rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, yes.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. Mr. Chairman, I made a dispassionate statement the other day—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I did not hear it.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. It was made in a Republican caucus, and I do not intend to betray the secrets of a caucus. But I stand by every word I said—that the election law in our State is every bit as bad as, if not worse than, the law upon the statute books of the State of Kentucky which resulted the other day in bloodshed and murder. And I want to ask the gentleman a question in this connection. If he drew the election law of Missouri, he is probably aware of the fact that under that new law there will not be appointed in the city of St. Louis, nor in the city of Kansas City, a Republican either as judge of elections or as clerk; consequently the machinery is entirely in the hands of the Democracy—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. So far as my own district is concerned—

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Wait a moment. I yielded for a question; not for a speech. I want to make my speech myself.

Mr. BARTHOLDT. The gentleman referred to my State; will he allow me a word in this connection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. We will give you time when I get through. I want to go on with my speech.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri declines to yield further.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The judges of election under that law are politically about half and half; so are the clerks. That answers the gentleman's statement. The new law, of which he complains, is an amendment to the law which I helped pass. This new law has never been tried. Consequently, nobody knows whether it is good or bad. Anyway, it applies only to the large cities and is intended to prevent corruption.

I have stated one reason assigned by the imperialists why we should go out carrying the blessings of liberty to the ends of the earth. Another class of them say, "It is Providence." I have heard a good many bad things unloaded on Providence, but I never heard anything as bad as that. To claim that this is the work of Providence reminds one of the old colored brother who said he had observed that when he prayed that Providence would send him a chicken he never got it; but when he prayed that Providence would send him to the chicken he usually got there. [Laughter.]

Another thing to demonstrate our fitness to do political missionary work among the effete monarchies of the East: Five Southern States are now taxing their ingenuity to eliminate the colored brother from the political equation without infracting the Federal Constitution, and you Northern people would do precisely the same thing under the same circumstances.

In fact, the Congress of the United States has carried that plan further than any Southern State has done, for right under the shadow of this Capitol 300,000 citizens of the District of Columbia, white and black, are disfranchised by act of Congress and have no more voice in the government under which they live than so many stocks and stones.

Physician, heal thyself!

There was one candid imperialist. That was the immortal soldier and statesman, Frederick the Great. He took Silesia, to which his ancestors had some shadowy claim two hundred years before his day. Through the horrors of the seven years' war, in which he soundly thrashed the Russians, Austrians, and French combined, he resolutely held on to his prey. All Europe in arms could not tear Silesia from his iron grasp. When all was over and he stood forth victor over all his foes, in a state paper one of his ministers undertook to demonstrate that it was the will of God, whereupon candid, heroic Frederick growled, "Strike it out. Leave the name of God out of that. Say I did it."

Our imperialists are not so courageous as Frederick. A good many of them beat about the bush; but some do not. Living out West has a tendency to increase and encourage independence of character.

Senator CARTER of Montana took a whack at this business not long ago. Here is what he said:

This is a practical age. We are going to deal with this question on the basis of dollars and cents. Neither religion nor sentiment will have much influence in determining the verdict. The great question will be, Will it pay? If we can show the country that it will, as I think we can, the American flag will never come down from the Philippines.

Mr. Chairman, when the Republican party was first organized it went forth to do battle against the entrenched powers of the land as the friend of humanity; and I do not believe that if Abra-

ham Lincoln and the coterie of great men who gathered around him were here to-day they would be willing to write the dollar mark as the sign in which the American people shall conquer. [Applause.] "Will it pay?" Are you willing to fritter away the liberty of coming generations that a lot of jobbers may be permitted to rake in a few dollars in the Philippine Islands?

But take the matter as the Senator from Montana puts it—on the low and debasing standard of the almighty dollar—and let us see how we will come out. It is said that figures will not lie. Here they are: The appropriations for the Army, passed in the spring of 1898, just before the Cuban war began, were \$23,129,344.80. The other day we passed an urgent deficiency bill carrying \$47,602,032.61 for the Army. The regular appropriation bill for the Army carried \$75,247,811, making a total of \$122,849,843.61 for the Army alone. Deduct from that the appropriation for the fiscal year, made in the spring of 1898, under normal conditions, and you have \$99,720,499.31 left as the cost of this imperial policy up to the present time for the Army alone.

That is the price of the Philippine war to date, exclusive of the increased expenditures for the Navy, exclusive of the awful waste of human life and human health, and exclusive of the expense of a long roll of pensioners, which our children to the third and fourth generation will not live long enough to see paid.

What have we to show for this immense expenditure of life and blood and tears and treasure? Nothing, absolutely nothing.

When will this war end? Can anybody predict the day, even approximately?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. DINSMORE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri be allowed to complete his remarks without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas can yield further time to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, I yield to him such time as he desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas yields to his colleague without limit, within the time that he possesses.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I thank my friend from Arkansas [Mr. DINSMORE], also the chairman of the committee [Mr. HITT], for their courtesy.

Mr. LACEY. Now that the gentleman's time has been extended, I want to ask him a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. LACEY. I understood the gentleman from Missouri, not long ago, to say that his party took the Republicans by the scruff of the neck and got them into this trouble.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I did not say any such thing. That speech of mine seems destined to be immortal. I will tell you what I said. I said that the Democratic party in this House took the Republican party by the scruff of the neck and dragged it into the Spanish war, and I stand by that statement. It is the truth of history. We did that very thing. But the Spanish war is not the Philippine war. You are simply making me say that a little sooner than I would have said it anyway. I wish to call the attention of lawyers to this fact:

The Constitution of the United States gives Congress the right to declare war. We declared it. You Republicans came in under a good deal of pressure. You had a "kickers" caucus around here that had eighty-five members in it, I have understood. At last you came in with a declaration of the Spanish war that Congress had the right to declare, that Congress did declare, and Congress carried that war to a glorious conclusion. And I say now that if that war had done nothing else except to give George Dewey and Winfield Scott Schley to immortality it is worth all that it cost.

But this war is not the Spanish war. It is not part of the Spanish war. Congress never authorized it, and Congress should stop it.

Mr. LACEY. I understood my friend was giving us a list of appropriations for the year 1898.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I gave you that as the last normal appropriation of the War Department.

Mr. LACEY. Immediately before the Spanish war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; and it was an appropriation made when nobody expected that there would be a war.

Now, I want to stir up your pure minds by way of remembrance. We went into that Spanish war with the solemn resolution of Congress that it was not for imperial aggrandizement or to enlarge our territory. What did we do that for, do you suppose? Did we do it because we had nothing else to do? Was it just a mere empty flourish of rhetoric? No; I will tell you what we put it in there for. For two reasons. In the first place, you never would have got a resolution through this Congress declaring war in the world if it had not been put in there, because there were enough of us here who dreaded this very thing to prevent it.

In the second place, we put it in there to secure the good opinion of mankind, to keep the old nations of the earth from getting scared at this lusty young giant of the West, and it did keep them off; and if anybody had had any idea that an attempt would have



been made to confine that resolution to Cuba, it would have been put into that resolution so broad that it would have covered every foot of land on the face of God's footstool.

We are in a nice fix, are we not? There is one other gentleman about whom I wish to express my opinion. A man stood up in the Senate of the United States not long ago and held up before the twinkling eyes of the members of the House of the Ancients a piece of glittering gold that he alleged he had picked up in the Philippine Islands, and said, in substance, "There are mountains of it over there, and for that reason we should go and dispossess the people and take their land."

Mr. Chairman, the junior Senator from Colorado did not overstep the mark when he denounced that speech as "base and sordid," and I will give my opinion of it in another way. There is scarcely a convicted thief in any penitentiary of any civilized country on the globe who did not land behind the bars by reason of just such temptation as the gentleman from the Wabash held up before the Senate of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, they quoted Scripture here the other day. I want to quote a little myself. It is written, "Judge a tree by its fruits." That is good gospel. It was wisdom before it was ever put in the Bible. What are the fruits of imperialism up to date? I am not going to overstate the case at all. In the first place, it has led us into abandoning the Declaration of Independence, which has made us what we are and glorified us in the eyes of the whole world. That is the first proposition.

Now, gentlemen, I have philosophized a good deal about that document. I want to say this to you. There is nothing new in the Declaration of Independence except two propositions, and they revolutionized this world. One of them is that all men are created equal; the other is that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. What did those two propositions do? Why, they made us a republic. They made all of North America a republic, except the British possessions. They made Central America a bevy of republics; they made South America republican. They made two republics in Europe and four in Africa, and gave liberty to the islands of the sea, and we did it. Mark Twain says, "Blessed is the man that bloweth his own horn, lest it shall not be blown." We did it. There is not a republic existing on earth to-day that does not exist by reason of our example and the twin propositions in the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal and that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

I never think about the condition of the world now that I do not bless God for the men who wrote the Declaration of Independence and for the men under Washington who made it good on a thousand battlefields. Think of what a Republican Secretary of State did. When Louis Napoleon, the lucky adventurer, took possession of Mexico, at a time when his arms glittered from China to Peru, when we got through with our family fight the first thing that the Secretary of State did was to notify him to get out of Mexico and not to stand on the order of his going, and he went; and Mexico exists to-day by reason of our patriotism, our courage, and our good sense.

But some fellow somewhere will get up and say that it is not true that all men are created equal; that one man is 6 high, another one only 5; that one man has the brain of a Webster and another is an idiot; one is black and another is white. Well, it never meant any such thing as that. It meant that every child is born into this world with the same political rights as any other child.

Latter-day Republicans sneer at the Declaration of Independence as composed of glittering generalities and barren idealities, not fit to be considered seriously by fin de siècle statesmen. Any man who asserts that it really means something, that it is the major charta of our liberties, that it contains the argument not only for our Revolution but for all representative government, is rated by these practical statesmen as a sickly sentimentalist.

Let me read you the words of a man famous for common sense wherever civilization abounds:

I never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the sentiments embodied in the Declaration of Independence. \* \* \* Now, my friends, can this country be saved upon this basis? If it can, I shall consider myself one of the happiest men in the world if I can help to save it. If it can not be saved upon that principle, it will be truly awful. But if this country can not be saved without giving up that principle, I was about to say I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender it.

Who do you suppose said that? Abraham Lincoln, the best product of Kentucky's fertile soil. When and where did he utter those memorable words which are a condemnation of all the jingoes in the land? In 1861, in Independence Hall, a place sacred to lovers of liberty everywhere.

Again he said:

What constitutes the bulwark of our own liberty and independence? It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoasts, our Army, or our Navy. These are not our reliances against danger. All of these may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men in all lands, everywhere.

Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seed of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with the chains of bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample on the rights of others, you have lost the strength of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you.

Still again he said:

No man is good enough to govern another man without that other's consent. When the white man governs himself, that is self-government; but when he governs himself and also governs another man, that is more than self-government—that is despotism. Our reliance is in the love of liberty which God has planted in us; our defense is in the spirit which prizes liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands, everywhere. They who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and under a just God can not long retain it.

As if endowed with prophetic power to see what would be happening here in 1900, Mr. Lincoln, at Lewiston, Me., said, in 1858.

Wise statesmen as they were, they knew the tendency of prosperity to breed tyrants; and so they established these great self-evident truths, that when in the distant future some man, some faction, some interest, should set up the doctrine that none but rich men, or none but white men, or none but Anglo-Saxon white men, were entitled to liberty and the pursuit of happiness, their posterity might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their fathers began. \* \* \* so that no man should thereafter dare to limit and circumscribe the principles on which the temple of liberty was being built.

Those words seem spoken to describe our imperialists, who sneer at the Declaration of Independence and its authors.

Republicans are fond of tracing their political pedigree to Alexander Hamilton, who condemned their present performances in these words:

National liberty is a gift of the beneficent Creator to the whole human race; and the civil liberty is founded on that, and can not be wrested from any people without the most manifest violation of justice.

Charles Sumner was once considered a great prophet in Republican Israel, and the popular voice endowed him with all the virtues of martyrdom. In an unguarded moment he said:

The words that "governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed" are sacred words, full of life-giving energy. Not simply national independence was here proclaimed, but also the primal rights of all mankind.

His illustrious successor in the Senate, the learned and venerable GEORGE FRISBIE HOAR, is now denounced as a traitor by cheap-John demagogues because he expresses sentiments similar to those of Sumner.

Sneer at the great Declaration and its self-evident truths, do you? Here are a few pearls of thought and patriotism culled at random from the archives of the Republican party in its better days:

*Resolved*, That the principle promulgated in the Declaration of Independence is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.—*Republican platform of June 17, 1856.*

*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence, that governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed, is essential to the preservation of our republican institutions.—*Republican platform of May 17, 1860.*

*Resolved*, This convention declares itself in sympathy with all oppressed people who are struggling for their rights. We recognize the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government, and we hail with gladness every effort toward making these principles a living reality on every inch of American soil.—*Republican platform of May 20, 1868.*

*Resolved*, That the Republican party has always been the champion of the oppressed and recognized the dignity of manhood, irrespective of faith, color, or nationality. It sympathizes with the cause of home rule in Ireland.—*Republican platform of June 10, 1893.*

Really, some Anglomaniac ought to move to strike out sympathy for Ireland and insert sympathy for John Bull in the awful but righteous trouncing he is just now receiving at the hands of Oom Paul Kruger.

But, gentlemen, we do not have to confine ourselves to quotations from the dead statesmen and to musty platforms in the years ago. There is an eminent, I may say preeminent, Republican jingo statesman now living—not only living, but living in clover—who not long since publicly and solemnly gave in his adhesion to the doctrines of the Declaration and with prophetic power condemned the present Philippine policy of the Administration. His name is William McKinley. He resideth in the White House. He hath offices galore to distribute to the faithful. But in a moment of temporary aberration he uttered these treasonable words:

I speak not of forcible annexation, for that, under our code of morals, would be criminal aggression.

Some supple-jack of a jingo ought to move to expunge those words from the records of the country and from human memory.

#### TESTIMONY OF A GREAT MISSOURIAN.

I will quote a few pregnant sentences lately spoken by a great Missouri Republican, now a resident of Washington, Gen. John B. Henderson. I like to quote Republicans when they talk wisdom and patriotism. John B. Henderson is one of the greatest lawyers ever in either branch of Congress. He was a brigadier-general in the Union Army, a Senator of the United States for eight years, President of the convention which nominated Blaine, and president of the Pan-American Congress. He is the

only man, living or dead, that ever refused a place on the supreme court bench of Missouri. He rendered his country and his party conspicuous service by having conscience, courage, brains, and patriotism enough to vote for the acquittal of Andrew Johnson, to prosecute the whisky ring even unto death, and to help defeat General Grant for a third term.

It will not do for gentlemen to sneer at General Henderson when he says:

For what purpose, then, are we conquering the Philippine people? And how are they to be governed when passed under the yoke of subjugation? These are the great questions which sooner or later we must solve for ourselves, and which the Philippine people have propounded to our rulers, beginning with the President and going down to the captains of companies, whose only reply has been to mow them down by thousands with the destructive arms of modern science. Shall these people be citizens of the United States, free to come and go from State to State? Shall they be governed by local legislatures of their own selection, represented in the Federal Congress, and clothed with all the rights of American freemen? Tell them this and the war will close in an hour. To tell them less is to deny the theory of our own Government, to subvert the foundations of American liberty, and to enter upon a system of imperialism as fatal and as corrupting to the governing power as is personal slavery to the master.

From these people we have concealed the records of our political history. We hide from ourselves, as we hide from them, the judicial interpretations of our own Constitution, and tell them with brazen front that the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution itself are but glittering generalities intended for the strong and not for the weak.

#### EVIDENCE OF AN EMINENT REPUBLICAN STATESMAN.

I now quote from a man who is admired and beloved by all friends of liberty wherever domiciled. His name is Carl Schurz. "To name him is to praise him." Born in Germany, he was one of that band of noble revolutionists who in 1848 strove heroically to make Europe free. He came to this country to find here that liberty which was unattainable there. The friend and confidant of Lincoln, he became a major-general, minister to Spain, Senator of the United States from Missouri, and Secretary of the Interior. He is universally recognized as a man of conscience, of courage, of brains, of learning, and of eloquence. At the age of three-score and ten he is still a great tribune of the people and an active friend of human freedom. I commend his words of wisdom to all who hear or read this speech. In speaking of the possibility of new States from our newly acquired territory, he says:

In Puerto Rico, for instance, politicians of lively ambition are already clamoring for the speedy organization of that island as a regular Territory, soon to be admitted as a State of the Union. You may say that they will have long to wait. Be not so sure of that. Consult your own experience. Has not more than one Territory, hardly fitted for statehood, been precipitated into the Union as a State when the majority party in Congress thought that by doing so its party strength could be augmented in the Senate and in the House and in the electoral college? Have our parties become so unselfishly virtuous that this may not happen again? So we may see Puerto Rico admitted before we have had time to rub our eyes.

You may say that little Puerto Rico would not matter much. But can any clear-thinking man believe that when we are once fairly started in the course of indiscriminate expansion we shall stop there? Will not the same reasons which induced us to take Puerto Rico also be used to show that the two islands of Santo Domingo, with Haiti, and of Cuba, which separate Puerto Rico from our coast, would, if they were in foreign hands, be a danger to us and that we must take them? Nothing could be more plausible. Why, the necessity of annexing Santo Domingo is already freely discussed, and agencies to bring this about are actually at work. And as to Cuba, every expansionist will tell you that it is only a matter of time. And does anyone believe that those islands, if annexed, will not become States of this Union? That would give us at least three, perhaps four, new States, with about 3,500,000 inhabitants—Spanish and French Creoles and negroes—with six or eight Senators and from fifteen to twenty Representatives in Congress, and a corresponding number of votes in the electoral college.

Nor are we likely to stop there. If we build and own the Nicaragua Canal, instead of neutralizing it, we shall easily persuade ourselves that our control of that canal will not be safe unless we own all the country down to it, so that it be not separated from our borders by any foreign, and possibly hostile power. Is this too adventurous an idea to become true? Why, it is not half as adventurous and extravagant as the idea of uniting to this Republic the Philippines, 9,000 miles away. It is already proposed to acquire in some way strips of territory several miles wide on each side of that canal for its military protection. But that will certainly be found insufficient if foreign countries lie between. We must, therefore, have those countries. That means Mexico and various small Central American republics, with a population in all of about 14,000,000, mostly Spanish-Indian mixture—making at least 15 States, entitled to 30 Senators and scores of Representatives and Presidential electors.

As to the character of the people whom those Senators, Members, and Presidential electors are to represent, I will let an authority speak that may astonish you, considering his present position—the Hon. Whitelaw Reid, who said in a public address at the time when the annexation of Santo Domingo was under discussion:

"This land greed of the Anglo-Saxon race is still at work. We have absorbed the best part of Mexico, but we have plenty of propagandists, mainly in the Army, and with influential voice near the head of the Government, clamorous for the rest. We have taken a foothold in the West Indies; it will be of God's mercy if we do not find the whole West Indian Archipelago crowded upon us to tax an already overloaded digestion. What are we to do with the turbulent, treacherous, ill-conditioned population? They have shown no faculty for self-government hitherto; and are we to precipitate them in a mass into the already sufficiently degraded elements of our national suffrage? We are trying the powers of Anglo-Saxon self-governing digestion upon 3,000,000 slaves; are the gastric juices of the body politic equal to the addition of the Mexicans, the Santo Domingans, the Cubans, the 'Conks' of the Bahamas, the Kanakas, and the rest of the inferior mixed races of our outlying tropical and semi-tropical dependencies?"

I could stand here till midnight and make quotations to show that in our present attitude, defending the Declaration of Independence, we occupy the position held by all the statesmen of all

parties prior to the beginning of the Philippine war, and that the jingoes are propagating theories to which the great and good among our public men would never have subscribed; but there is no use to waste my strength and consume your time.

Another thing. Name the Constitution to one of these imperialists, and what answer do you get? Why, Gen. Wesley Merritt blurted out, what most of you were thinking, that "the Constitution is played out, it is not even worth discussing."

They sneer at Washington's Farewell Address, that everybody, including Mr. McKinley himself, has acknowledged as containing the wisdom of the world. Abandon the Monroe doctrine—that is what imperialism means—at once and without a struggle; because it stands to reason and to nature that we can not play the dog in the manger on this continent and at the same time colonize in the Eastern Hemisphere. Let us take another thing which has been done and which has been applauded by the public conscience. The other day, in a ground swell of virtue, this House rose in its might and took Brigham H. Roberts by the nape of the neck and slack of the trousers and set him out in the cold, cold world. [Laughter.]

Now, why, gentlemen? Because he had three wives; but the real argument against Roberts was never stated on this floor, and that was that it invaded the Democratic doctrine of equal rights to all and special privileges to none. [Renewed laughter.] But we performed that very virtuous act when we put him out because he had three wives, although Brigham H. Roberts was a Democrat. Now, this Republican Administration goes into an agreement or treaty—I do not care what they call it, but some kind of a paper—by which it takes into the employment of the United States Government that eminent Republican officeholder, the Sultan of Sulu, who has 300 wives. [Laughter.] Now, we Democrats, we virtuous Democrats—

Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi. And we pay him tribute.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; I will tell you about that in a few moments. We virtuous Democrats joined with you virtuous Republicans and put out of this House a polygamous Democrat. Now, as one good turn deserves another, I ask you virtuous Republicans to join hands with us virtuous Democrats and not admit within the American Union that eminent Republican officeholder, the Sultan of Sulu. [Laughter.] What are you doing? You are paying him \$250 a month and you are paying his dato, Murah Jara, \$75 a month. What are the duties of Murah Jara? Why, he is the keeper of the Sultan's harem [laughter]; and if you go on with this thing no Republican statesman will be properly equipped for a seat in the American Congress unless he has a harem and a keeper of his harem. [Great laughter.] I believe in having one wife, and I never saw what anybody wanted with more, and I am teetotally opposed to me or my people helping pay a part of the salary of the keeper of anybody's harem.

Let us see another thing about it, because it is all here. What are we doing now? Paying tribute to a petty tyrant. That is the plain fact. You can not wriggle out of it; that is what it is—paying tribute to a petty despot for the privilege of running the American flag up on the strawstack he inhabits as his palace. [Great laughter.] When did an American President ever pay tribute before? I will tell you. George Washington had to, because he could not help it. John Adams did it for the same reason; but when Thomas Jefferson came in, the only red-headed President of the United States [laughter and applause]—and in that connection, if the color of a man's hair has anything to do with his deeds, it is high time that another red-headed man should become President [renewed laughter]—he refused to pay tribute to the Barbary pirates, and ordered a Democratic Lieutenant of the United States Navy to shell them out of their holes, which he did, and that was the end of the United States paying tribute at the Straits of Gibraltar or anywhere else.

Now, in the closing year of the nineteenth century, if not the first of the twentieth, the President of the United States, the President of 75,000,000 of people, pledged himself to pay this tribute to a petty despot whose very name you do not know. How do they justify it? Why, President Schurman has admitted in his declaration that it includes slavery and polygamy both. Schurman made defense of it. What reason do you think he gave? He said, "They tolerated slavery and they tolerated polygamy because these things were a part of their religion."

Now, my brothers, did not Brigham H. Roberts stand in this very House and justify his position on the ground that it was a part of his religion? Did he not? What else did Schurman say? He said the kind of slavery they have over there is a very mild form, a sort of patriarchal institution. Did you ever hear that kind of talk before? You young men never did, but the older men here know that that was precisely the defense that the people of twelve or thirteen States of the American Union made, that African slavery was a mild form, a sort of patriarchal institution. We are coming to it again. Verily, the whirligig of time brings its own revenges.

Now, I want somebody to answer this question. If polygamy



is wrong in the United States, is it right in Asia? Is it? The last Democratic President of the United States, James Buchanan, sent an army to thrash the Mormons in Utah. The latest Republican President of the United States, and, let us hope, the last, enters into some kind of an agreement—they say it is not a treaty—with a polygamist of the Sulu Islands. I submit that if Brigham Young was a criminal for having 26 wives, the Sultan of Sulu is a greater criminal for having 300 wives. [Laughter.] Did you ever hear of the question of slavery and what it did? For four long years it made this country red with the best blood of the nation because some people thought other people should not buy and sell human flesh. But I submit that what is wrong in America is not right in Asia. And if it is wrong for an American citizen to own a black African, it is wrong for anybody to own a brown Asiatic.

Now, one other thing. How do you like this paying of tribute? I do not believe you people like it any better than I do. Do you know what was the first infallible sign of the decline and fall of the Roman Empire? It was paying tribute to barbarians. Armies destroyed might be replaced, cities razed might be rebuilt, but when the insatiable barbarian got the first taste of Roman tribute he never stopped until his whiskered pandours and fierce hussars rode through the vine-clad hills of Italy and fed their horses in the temples of the Romans of the seven-hilled city.

Let us see another thing that this imperialism has brought us to—a press censorship. These are the fruits of the tree of forbidden knowledge. A press censorship! Do you know what was the only party that ever established a press censorship in this country? It was the old Federalist party. It passed a law making it a crime to speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States, or of the Vice-President, or of the Supreme Court, or of the Senate or House of Representatives, or any member thereof. Good heavens! Just think of it! Suppose that law had been on the statute book during the last two years of Cleveland's second Administration; where would we have been? Every man jack of us would have been in prison and not one would have escaped. [Laughter.] Yes, on both sides of the House. [Laughter.] Suppose that was the law now; where would a good many of us be? In durance vile.

But in 1800 the American people arose in their wrath and might and hurled the old Federalist party from power and buried it in a grave upon which there is inscribed, "No resurrection;" and if the Republican party in the United States persists in this press censorship it will follow the old Federalist party in the broad and dusty pathway to oblivion.

Another bitter fruit of the tree of imperialism is that it makes our Government callous to the Macedonian cry which comes to us from other peoples who are fighting for the right to govern themselves.

The love of freedom is not confined to any latitude or longitude. Wherever people are struggling for liberty they should have the friendship of all Americans.

It is astounding that there should be any argument as to that proposition within the broad confines of this puissant Republic. Two years ago there would not have been; but a change, a marvelous change, has come over the spirit of our dream.

In the elder day we would have made the welkin ring; now, officially speaking, we are dumb as oysters. Wherefore? Because England is a robber nation; we are ambitious to become a robber nation; and all robber nations must stand together for self-protection; and because it is so English, don't you know!

That's official America, mark you—only official America. From its sordid and inhuman verdict we appeal to the unofficial masses, who make and unmake statesmen, the great body of our citizenship, whom Abraham Lincoln affectionately denominated "the plain people"—yes, the plain people, the honest people, the uncorrupted people, who do not covet their neighbor's land, whose eyes are not blinded by the sheen of their neighbor's gold, whose cupidity is not excited by the sparkle of their neighbor's diamonds, who do not believe that larceny, burglary, arson, and murder are fundamentals of political economy and Christian civilization, and in whose pure and tender hearts the sweet song of human freedom is forever singing.

The Senate of the United States may laugh to scorn Senator Mason's resolution of sympathy with the Boers, but the toiling millions of America will send their sympathy and their hearty Godspeed across the sea to the brave burghers who are the best marksmen seen on earth since Andrew Jackson's immortal day at New Orleans.

Why should we not sympathize with these sturdy defenders of their liberty, their homes, their wives, and their little children? They are in the right. Not only that—they have five times as much cause for fighting as our fathers had in 1775.

Daniel Webster once declared that our Revolutionary sires went to war about a preamble; but if that be true, it is also true that the essence of that preamble was the right of self-government, for which the Boers are fighting.

Twice they have abandoned their humble homes and removed into the wilderness to get rid of the English; but the villain still pursues them.

Why should we not express our sympathy?

The precedents all favor such action.

We passed resolutions of sympathy with the Greeks, when struggling heroically to break the yoke of the unspeakable Turk, and in advocacy of those resolutions Daniel Webster established his fame as an orator by his lofty and impassioned appeal to the moral sentiment of the world—the same sentiment which we now invoke in behalf of an oppressed and long-suffering people.

Under the lead of that matchless Kentuckian, Henry Clay, we hastened to express our sympathy with the nascent South American republics, thereby assisting them to throw off their Spanish chains; and we did our duty by that act.

We did these things when we were a feeble folk.

Then we were willing to defy the world, the flesh, and the devil to aid anybody anywhere struggling for freedom.

Now, that we are so strong that we can not estimate our strength, we have fallen to the low estate of being John Bull's silent partner in butchering and despoiling white men—flesh of our flesh and bone of our bone—fighting valiantly and gloriously for their altars and their fires. Shame upon such a craven spirit!

If gold and diamonds had never been discovered in grand old Paul Kruger's bailiwick, there would have been no war. It is the Boers' gold and diamonds that the English are fighting for, and not the rights of the Utlanders. Any weak people discovering gold, diamonds, or anything of value may expect a visit from Mr. Bull.

I hope he will get his fill of gold. I hope it from the bottom of my heart. I want him to get it as Crassus got it.

He waged a war against the Parthians to gobble their gold. They defeated his legions, cut off his head, poured melted gold down his dead throat, and, in derision, said: "Now, Crassus, thou hast thy gold!"

So may it be with Johnny Bull in South Africa and to all who are the foes of human liberty.

I do not wish to weary the House, but there is another branch of this matter I want to mention briefly. This appetite for islands grows with what it feeds on. When we took in the Sandwich Islands I said then it was only the beginning of the end.

Now we have the Sandwich Islands; we have the island of Guam; we have Puerto Rico; we intend to swallow Cuba at the first opportunity; we are reaching out for the Philippines. One day two weeks ago the Philadelphia Inquirer had an editorial advocating the purchase by the United States of the Danish West India Islands—St. John, St. Croix, and St. Thomas. The very same day the Philadelphia North American had an editorial advocating the proposition that we buy the Galapagos Islands. Now, I undertake to say, unless you have rubbed up your geography lately, there is not a man in the House who would know which way to start—north, south, east, or west—if required to start instantly for the Galapagos Islands.

One other proposition. They say that where the American flag has once been raised it shall never be hauled down. The President of the United States said that. My friend from Ohio, General GROSVENOR, is the originator of that absurd theory. A more preposterous one was never hatched in the brain of man. I do not believe that the President had any more intention of making that speech when he started South than I have of undertaking to fly. But he got down there among the Southern people; they are warm-hearted, hospitable, generous, enthusiastic, feather-headed, and they sometimes boil over. [Laughter.] I love the Southrons with all the intensity of my being; for blood is thicker than water. When he got down there, with his engaging personality and handsome presence, it was such a relief from Cleveland that they went wild in their enthusiasm; and, as the newspapers stated, he interpolated that clause into his written speech at the banquet when it was past midnight—"Who shall haul down the American flag? Men of Dixie, will you haul it down?" Of course they swore by the horns of the altar that they would not haul it down. [Laughter.] And in their then excited frame of mind and exaltation of spirit, they would have sworn just as cheerfully and vociferously to storm the gates of hell or scale the mountains of the moon.

Now, I have not attended very many banquets; I have attended a few; but my opinion is that the poorest place on the American continent to ascertain the cool, deliberate, settled judgment of the American people is at a banquet, especially in the South at 2 o'clock in the morning "betwixt the walnuts and the wine." [Laughter.]

Now, let us see where this doctrine would land us. The proposition is that we are not going to haul down the American flag. Did any Roman emperors ever haul down their flag? Adrian, one of the greatest of them, hauled it down, and everybody has applauded him since.

There used to be a man named Napoleon Bonaparte, who roamed around a good deal away from home. [Laughter.] He

may be called the most masterful flag raiser of that age. He ran up the French flag on every capital of Europe except London, and I have always been sorry he did not run it up there. Did he always keep his flag up where he first put it? Why, bless your souls, no. He pulled it down at Berlin, at Vienna, at Madrid, and—I was about to say a thousand other places. He took the French eagles back to their eyrie on the banks of the Seine. If my friend General GROSVENOR had been there he would have said, "Sire, you will sully your reputation. Where the French flag has once waved it must wave—"

"Forever and forever,  
As long as the river flows,  
As long as the heart has passions,  
As long as life hath woes."

And when Victoria, Louis Napoleon, and the Sultan of Turkey went into the Crimean war Queen Vic got into rather bad company on both sides. They ran up their flags on Russian soil. Did they keep them there? No; they pulled them down, and were glad to have an opportunity to pull them down and go home. If they had not done so Kinglake's history of the Crimean war would have contained so many volumes that the world would not have held them.

Does England always keep her flag up where she has hoisted it? She had floated it over every capital of Europe except that of Russia. She once floated it over the Philippines, but pulled it down again. On a day that no American can remember except with shame and humiliation the British burned this Capitol, and over its ruins ran up the cross of St. George. Did they keep it there? No. If they had undertaken to keep it there, what would have happened? Why, every boy and half the girls born in the United States since that time would have died in the attempt to haul down that hateful rag.

Let us recur to our own history. Have we always kept our flag where we ran it up? Why, sir, we ran it up on the river Thames, in Canada. One of my kinsmen died on that battlefield running up that flag. We ran up our flag over the halls of the Montezumas, in Mexico; we ran it up on the walls of the Barbary powers, in Africa. Did we keep it up? No; when it had answered the purposes for which it was put up we pulled it down and brought it back into our own country, and have been stronger and better ever since for doing so.

Let me tell you something further about running up the flag and hauling it down. To say that you will never haul down the flag from any place where it has once been hoisted, means a war of extermination inevitably.

When John A. Dix at the beginning of the civil war telegraphed, "If any man undertakes to haul down the American flag, shoot him on the spot," it fired the patriotic heart of the land, because that flag was floating where it ought to float. But whenever you run it up where it has got no business, it ceases to be the banner of the free and the emblem of liberty and becomes to the people where it is run up an emblem of slavery and humiliation.

Now, gentlemen, I must stop, of course. But one other thing I want to suggest to you. It is not pleasant to play the rôle of Cassandra, but people ought to learn by experience.

Why will we learn nothing from the sad fate of those who have gone before? I had an uncle somewhat given to wild ways. My father, an older man, advised him to profit by the experience of others. "Oh," replied the ardent youth, "I want to experience these things myself." We are acting in precisely the same reckless manner. Strong beyond computation, happier than any other people on earth, growing by leaps and bounds, yet with the history of the world for six thousand years before our faces we are hastening with flying feet into that broad and easy pathway whose end is death.

Take a few from the innumerable examples which history furnishes for our instruction—examples authenticated beyond all cavil.

Greece was the first great nation of Europe. As long as she was contented to remain within the bounds which nature fixed for her she flourished, the home of art, poetry, learning, commerce, and valor. But Greece was not big enough for Alexander, who, not satisfied with being the son of Philip of Macedonia, boasted that he was Ammon's son. So he started out to slaughter, to conquer, and to seek universal dominion. We certainly can not hope to beat him at his own game. You know what befell him. But where be the cities now which he founded? Where the empire which he created? The glory of his own country, which he debauched, ruined, and enslaved?

Then Rome arose upon the banks of the yellow Tiber; waxed strong, spread out till Rome was synonymous with the civilized world; lorded it over all creation for some centuries; broke to pieces of her own weight and own rottenness; became the victim of the cruel barbarian and followed Greece to the graveyard of nations.

"In the second century of the Christian Era the Empire of Rome comprehended the fairest part of the earth and the most

civilized portion of mankind. The frontiers of that extensive monarchy were guarded by ancient renown and disciplined valor." Those are the splendid sentences with which Edward Gibbon opens *The History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, the saddest story in the annals of the human race. Dull indeed must be the man, cold must be his heart, whose imagination, fired by those two glowing and gorgeous sentences, does not conjure up for his contemplation magnificent pictures of human happiness and human prosperity. But, alas! the six large volumes which he wrote are almost exclusively devoted to giving a melancholy, a heart-rending history of human folly, human depravity, human weakness, human misery, and human poltroonery, such as can be found nowhere else in the entire realm of literature.

Here and there a flash of genius, an act of patriotism, a deed of humanity, a feat of heroism, lights up the somber scene of desolation and woe—only the last flickerings of the expiring candle. Constantly, forever downward, the great historian leads our steps, through suffering and decay, from the accession of Augustus Cæsar to the fall of Constantinople—scenes twelve hundred years apart, but welded together for our instruction and our warning. The end may be described succinctly as "Darkness everywhere; chaos come again."

I wish most fervently that every citizen of this Republic could be compelled to read carefully and prayerfully Gibbon's stupendous work. It would wound the jingoes past all surgery, give the coup de grâce to imperialism on this continent, and save our children from a fate at the contemplation of whose horrors even the bravest of us must shudder.

Over and over and over again he tells us with an emphasis which can never be forgotten that "the decline and fall of the Roman Empire" was caused by the failure of the successors of Augustus to follow the sage advice of that crafty statesman to keep the empire within safe, reasonable, and natural bounds. With their evil example and its awful consequences before our eyes, we seem determined to plunge headlong into the black and bottomless abyss in which they disappeared forever from human ken.

If you desire a poetical description of Rome after their folly and wickedness had wrought their perfect work of destruction, read the famous lines of Lord Byron, the greatest poet that ever lived:

O Rome! my country! city of the soul!  
The orphans of the heart must turn to thee,  
Lone mother of dead empires! and control  
In their shut breasts their petty misery.  
What are our woes and sufferance? Come and see  
The cypress, hear the owl, and plod your way  
O'er steps of broken thrones and temples, Yel  
Whose agonies are evils of a day—  
A world is at our feet as fragile as our clay.

The Niobe of nations! there she stands,  
Childless and crownless, in her voiceless woe;  
An empty urn within her wither'd hands,  
Whose holy dust was scatter'd long ago;  
The Scipios' tomb contains no ashes now;  
The very sepulchers lie tenantless  
Of their heroic dwellers: dost thou flow,  
Old Tiber! through a marble wilderness?  
Rise, with thy yellow waves, and mantle her distress.

The Goth, the Christian, Time, War, Flood, and Fire,  
Have dealt upon the seven-hill'd city's pride;  
She saw her glories star by star expire,  
And up the steep barbarian monarchs ride,  
Where the car climb'd the Capitol; far and wide  
Temple and tower went down, nor left a site—  
Chaos of ruins! who shall trace the void,  
O'er the dim fragments cast a lunar light,  
And say, "Here was, or is," where all is double night?

The double night of ages, and of her,  
Night's daughter, Ignorance, hath wrapp'd, and wrap  
All round us; we but feel our way to err:  
The ocean hath its chart, the stars their map,  
And Knowledge spreads them on her ample lap;  
But Rome is as the desert, where we steer  
Stumbling o'er recollections; now we clap  
Our hands, and cry, "Eureka!" it is clear—  
When but some false mirage of ruin rises near.

Then came Mohammed, camel driver and prophet, with the Koran in one hand and the sword in the other, and founded in blood and on fanaticism an empire which spread until it looked as though it were to be universal; but on the field of Tours and under the walls of Vienna Charles Martel and John Sobieski rolled back the tide of Saracen invasion, which has been receding ever since, until the latest of his successors is the laughing-stock of royalty, and "the Sick Man of Europe" is permitted to play at being a monarch only because the great powers can not agree as to who shall own Constantinople, the key to the eastern world.

At the astounding historic pageant at Brussels, when Charles V, weary of glory, of power, of conquest, and of the world, abdicated in favor of Philip II, he could with perfect truth have made the proud boast which Daniel Webster made for England, that the sun never set upon his dominions and that his morning drum-beat encircled the globe. Not only Spain was his, but also Italy,



Sicily, Austria, the Netherlands, the Floridas, most of North, Central, and South America, and nearly all the islands of all the seas. Even the great highway of the ocean was denominated the Spanish Main. But his immense and glittering empire was an unnatural, an incongruous, an incoherent, an incompatible conglomeration of states, and only last year we, who as a nation were in our swaddling clothes when that great Emperor doffed his crown and be-took him to a monastery, gave the finish to his abnormal empire.

Next came Louis XIV, the Grand Monarque, who was King for seventy-two years; who for half a century did bestride this narrow world like a Colossus; who, in the plenitude of his power, dreamed that he could defy the immutable laws of nature and by a family compact could give the earth and the fullness thereof in fee simple to his descendants; whose old age was made bitter by Blenheim, Oudenarde, Ramillies, and Malplaquet, by the loss of armies, battles, and provinces; whose cup of humiliation was filled to overflowing by the invasion of La Belle France; whose grandson died upon the block, and whose heirs are mere phantom kings—wanderers and vagabonds upon the face of the earth.

Close upon his august heels came the marvelous Corsican, the wonderful warrior, the self-styled "Armed Soldier of Democracy," who boasted that he found the crown of France in the gutter, picked it up on the point of his sword, and with his own hands clapped it upon his own head. Had he been warned by the fate of his predecessors, he would have died upon the throne, left it to his son, and in history would have been named "Napoleon the Invincible." Not so, however. Filled with the vain lust of universal dominion, he, too, caught the fatal mania of imperialism. He conquered kingdoms, empires, and principalities. He deposed kings and queens and potentates until Europe was full of fleeing royalties. He made queens of his sisters, kings of his brothers, brothers-in-law, and even of his stable boys. In his vainglory he called his baby heir by the high-sounding title of King of Rome; but in an evil hour for him—a blessed hour for humanity—he, too, ran up against the inexorable law of nature; his legions perished in the snows of Russia, and at last, a prisoner on a tropic isle, he died in a delirium, shouting, "Tête d'armée!"

At last appeared John Bull as the great practitioner of the fatal theory of imperialism. He gobbled North America, a portion of South America, a large slice of Asia, most of northern Africa, the majority of all the islands in the bosom of the multitudinous seas. John was the greatest imperialist of them all. He had a long and successful run. At last he butted his hard head against Spion Kop and lost his glory in the Modder River. Many men hope and more believe that John has reached his highest point and hastes now to his setting, and that in South Africa, at the hands of old Paul Kruger, he will find his Waterloo.

Unless we are the veriest idiots upon whom God has showered his blessings, rich and manifold, we will profit by the dreadful example of these and others who have gone to ruin by the fatal process of imperialism.

Oh, yes; but they ask if Jefferson did not expand. Of course he did on rational principles. I am not against expansion on rational principles and in proper directions. I am to-day in favor of taking every foot of the British North American possessions. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They join our territory. Their people are educated in self-government. We would welcome them as citizens, and we would then not have John Bull for our nearest neighbor. Jefferson expanded, and I thank God that he was President in 1803, for if he had not been we never would have had the trans-Mississippi country. We needed it in our business. It was necessary for our healthy growth and for our perpetuity. It was contiguous territory. It had nobody in it except the Indians, whom we intended to kill, and a few white people who wanted to come with us. That is the truth. But even Napoleon, who can not be counted among the friends of liberty, stipulated that the Louisiana purchase should be admitted as a State or States and the people thereof protected in the enjoyment of their religious and political rights. We had to have the Floridas, because we did not want Spain with a foothold south of us and England with a foothold north of us. We had to acquire Texas—that was a part of the Louisiana purchase, too—because if we did not have it a foreign nation would come up to Missouri, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Kansas. In all these cases we were seeking a natural frontier and we got it. But over yonder there is a people alien to us; 10,000 miles away from us. There are sixty of them to the square mile, and there are only twelve of us to the square mile here. There is no room for our people there, even if they could stand the climate.

I am proud of being a native of Kentucky; prouder of being a Missourian by adoption; proudest of all of being an American. I have made this speech because I wanted to contribute my mite to the preservation of representative government.

When I look into the faces of my little children my heart swells with ineffable pride to think that they are citizens of this mighty Republic, one and indivisible, built not for a day but for all time, bottomed on eternal truth and right and justice, and if we are true to our principles and faithful to our mission, destined under

God to be the dominating influence through all the centuries yet to be.

And now may the God of our fathers, the God who inspired the tongue and heart of Patrick Henry, the God who guided the hand of Jefferson while he traced the greatest state paper in the tide of time, the God who sustained Washington and his starving men during seven years of awful war and gave them complete victory on the blood-stained heights of Yorktown, may He preserve this great Republic, the last hope of constitutional government on the face of the earth, from all its enemies, foreign and domestic, and from its unwise friends who would lure it into the path that certainly leadeth to destruction. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SIBLEY].

Mr. SIBLEY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure we have all been entertained if not instructed by our eloquent friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I have received in my mail to-day the utterance of another gentleman from Missouri that I am going to read, to show that there is not a unanimity of sentiment even in Missouri. It says:

MY DEAR MR. SIBLEY—

I was going to leave out a little of it, but I will read it all—

Your patriotic speech of yesterday pleased me beyond expression. Within the last month there has been a decided change of sentiment amongst our people, and they are becoming much more Democratic as to sustaining the Government. Our Populistic brethren have worked the cry of anti-expansion for all it was worth, but Democratic instinct refused to accept it as part of our political faith.

Our friends must get back into line or be left, for as sure as we live our party in Missouri is in favor of holding the Philippine Islands as United States territory and of ultimately making a State in the Union of Cuba. We can conceive of no greater measure of liberty or a situation of more independence than being a State in the Union. We look forward with pleasure to the time when our Union of States will be increased by additions of Commonwealths created from the territories we have taken from Spain in our last glorious war.

That is from a Democrat.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri and others on the Democratic side. Name him!

Mr. SIBLEY. That is a personal letter. I have written the gentleman for his permission to give his name; but he is a man who sat on the floor of this House for many years and raised his voice for the principles of Democracy. He was a Chicago platform Democrat [applause on the Republican side], and I had the honor to sit with him in this body.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri and Mr. DINSMORE rose.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friend for one moment's interruption.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. SIBLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I will ask you if that gentleman is not at this time a candidate for an appointment by the McKinley Administration, and if he does not live in Jasper County?

Mr. SIBLEY. I believe this gentleman would not accept any appointment to a Federal position or other position.

Mr. DINSMORE. Will my friend from Pennsylvania yield to me? I desire to ask him if he can explain to me why, if this letter is written by a Democrat, who sat upon this floor as a Democrat, appealing to my friend from Pennsylvania as a Democrat, saying that this party—the Democratic party—must get back to the traditions of Democracy as set forth in the speech which my friend from Pennsylvania made only a day or two ago, the only indorsement and applause it elicited in this House came from the Republican party on the other side of the Chamber. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SIBLEY. Perhaps that is correct. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have been invited so many times to take my seat upon the other side of the Chamber that, if standing by the convictions I hold, if standing in defense of all that makes for higher life and better government, if standing patriotically by my country as against her open enemies, it is necessary for a man to sit upon that side of the Chamber, you can constructively place this seat there at this very minute. [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

Upon the floor of this House you have said to-day that my position in the past was one thing and in two years was another thing, and that two years from now it might be different. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] That I grant you. My hope is that I may ever keep with the living present rather than with the dead past. [Applause on the Republican side.] I would rather be true to the present than consistent with the past. I have been charged with turning my coat. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

I want to tell you that whenever the time comes that the other side of my coat looks better than this side, I will change it quicker than any man you ever saw. [Applause on the Republican side and laughter on the Democratic side.] I want to tell you that there is many a Democrat who can change his coat and cover up the rags and tatters that he is now wearing and present a more

respectable appearance to the public view. [Laughter and applause.]

If I were a prodigal, living on the dry husks of the past, and were compelled to eat the fodder with the swine I kept and quarrel with them for a scanty pittance, upon an invitation to a feast and a clean robe I would leave the husks for the sake of the better surroundings elsewhere afforded and leave to my friend from Arkansas, if he will, the diet of husks. That is all I care to say at the present. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DINSMORE. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, nobody has just cause to complain about a change of opinion by any servant of the public. It is commendable rather than censurable that one shall follow conscience and judgment wherever it leads. But it does not follow that when one's opinions change he is justified in arrogating to himself such superiority of judgment as to entitle him to say that men who do not see fit to change their opinions quite so frequently as he are necessarily less intelligent or less progressive. I apprehend that nobody on this floor will question the right of any representative of the people to change his mind upon any or even all current public questions. If such a change involves inconsistency, it is a question between him and his constituents, and not to be passed upon by anybody in this Chamber.

As to the fundamental precepts of liberty many of us have not experienced a change of heart. I for one think the Democratic party can afford to base its action in reference to legislation affecting every creature within our jurisdiction on the Declaration of Independence. It can afford to base its action on the Constitution of the United States. It can afford to base its action on the rulings of the Supreme Court and the writings and speeches of the great men who have attempted to define what Congress may and may not do in applying our system to acquired territory. I believe that careful study of these precedents and opinions is a safer guide than can be found in beautiful phrases, high-sounding platitudes, and well-rounded periods. Such speeches charm the imagination, but, unfortunately, are not always instructive. It is unquestionably true that in the past the Democratic party has been the champion of expansion in this country, but it has expanded republican institutions as well as territory. Democratic expansion means enlargement of the domain blessed by constitutional government and liberty as well as of the boundaries of the United States. We would take under our flag no people inimical to its institutions. We would not impose the Government of the United States upon any country by force.

I believe that the Declaration of Independence means something. I believe that all men are created equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights. I believe that governments do derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. Is that heresy? I believe that a government imposed by violence and force is tyranny. Is that heresy or is it Democracy? It is true that the great party of which I am an humble member and whose principles I devoutly believe has added to this nation a vast area of territory, but it is American territory and has been carved into American States. It is to-day peopled by Americans, whose great achievements have increased our material prosperity without in the least disparaging or injuring the politics, institutions, or morals of the country.

If we are to annex the Philippine Islands, it must be with the understanding that the Constitution applies to every part of the territory of the United States. The Constitution says that taxation shall be equal throughout the United States, and the Supreme Court has said that the United States comprises not only the States of the Union, but all territory belonging to the United States. The programme of the imperialist requires avoidance of this provision. We are to have tariff laws levying taxes in our new possessions which are unknown in the States, and in order to carry out this programme a new theory is promulgated as to the meaning of the Constitution. Gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber must be aware that a construction has been placed upon the organic law fatal to their programme, and yet they would attempt to haggle and split hairs about what the words "United States" mean, doubtless hoping that the Supreme Court may be induced to reverse its former decision.

Mr. Chairman, you can not find in the literature of the Republic prior to last year a single syllable that even suggests a limitation of the benign provisions of the Constitution to citizens dwelling in the States comprising the Union. Now, we here proposed the adoption of the theory of liberty preached and practiced by the Romans. They said liberty was for the Romans and slavery for the remainder of mankind. Jefferson taught that liberty was for mankind. Hitherto the Democratic party has professed this faith, and I trust it may ever adhere to it. [Applause.] [Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration House bill 7941, making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reports that that committee has had under consideration House bill 7941, and has come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have permission not to so much extend my remarks in the RECORD as to straighten them up, rearrange, and fix them to suit myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that he may extend or rearrange his remarks made to-day in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was ordered printed, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, covering extensive field operations, consisting of soil surveys over various areas aggregating 720,000 acres. In the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture, this is the most important work of its kind ever undertaken.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 5, 1900.

#### SENATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bills and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees as indicated below:

S. 746. An act to authorize C. R. Dobbins to accept a watch awarded to him by the government of the Dominion of Canada in recognition of his humane and gallant services to the shipwrecked crew of the British schooner *Ashton*, of Weymouth, Nova Scotia—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

S. 707. An act for the relief of Charles T. Rader—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 421. An act for the relief of Napolian B. Giddings—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 422. An act for the relief of George A. Orr—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 423. An act for the relief of Joseph W. Carmack—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 424. An act for the relief of John S. Neet, jr.—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 425. An act for the relief of John M. Davis—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 426. An act for the relief of Ezra S. Havens—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 427. An act for the relief of A. F. Fleet—to the Committee on Claims.

S. 428. An act for the relief of Laura S. Gillingwaters, widow of J. E. Gillingwaters—to the Committee on War Claims.

S. 432. An act for the relief of James W. Howell, late of Company H, Fifty-fourth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 433. An act for the relief of Richard C. Silence—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 436. An act to correct the military record of Perry J. Knoles—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 437. An act for the relief of Isaac McConnaughay, private, Company H, Fortieth Iowa Infantry Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 438. An act for the correction of the military record of James M. Crabtree—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 439. An act for the correction of the military record of John R. Leonard—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 359. An act to extend the privilege of immediate transportation of dutiable goods to the port of Astoria, Oreg.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 1590. An act for the erection of a public building at Providence, R. I.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. R. 51. Joint resolution recognizing the gallantry of Frank H. Newcomb, commanding the revenue cutter *Hudson*; of his officers and men; also retiring Capt. Daniel B. Hodgson, of the Revenue-Cutter Service, for efficient and meritorious services in command of the cutter *Hugh McCulloch* at Manila—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Senate concurrent resolution 22:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That there be printed for immediate use as a public document 11,000 copies of the proceedings in connection with the reception of the Webster statue on January 18, 1900, as reported by the committee of arrangements, of which 1,000 shall be for the use of Mr. Stilson Hutchins, 4,000 for the use of the Senate, and



6,000 for the use of the House of Representatives; also 10,000 copies in the form prescribed by law for printing enologies, of which, in cloth binding, 1,000 shall be for the use of Mr. Hutchins, 3,000 delivered to the Senators and Representatives of the States of New Hampshire and Massachusetts, 2,000 for the use of the Senate, and 4,000 for the use of the House of Representatives—to the Committee on Printing.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair calls attention to Senate bill 197, for the relief of Hattie Phillips, which was erroneously sent to the Committee on Pensions when it should have been referred to the Committee on War Claims. Without objection, it will be so referred.

There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows: To Mr. RHEA of Kentucky, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey, until Thursday, on account of death.

#### LEAVE TO PRINT IN THE RECORD.

Mr. DINSMORE. Mr. Speaker, in order to give the privilege to certain members of the House who do not care to speak on the present bill, I ask unanimous consent that members of the House may have the privilege to print in the RECORD for a term of five days.

Mr. STEELE. I think the gentleman had better make it one day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that all members may be permitted to print remarks on the bill pending before the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for five days.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I am not disposed to object to this request; but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that this has been repeated time after time, so that there are already three or four consents for matters of this kind.

Mr. STEELE. I object.

Mr. DINSMORE. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will make the request for one day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that members of the House may be permitted to print in the RECORD for one day. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for establishing an Indian agency at Leech Lake, Minn.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for certain judicial salaries, and a request in relation to an appropriation for penitentiary at Fort Leavenworth—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for classification of mineral lands in Montana and Idaho—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey and estimate of cost of improving harbor of New London, Conn.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination and survey of Arthur Kill, or Staten Island Sound, New York and New Jersey—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an abstract of the militia force of the United States—to the Committee on the Militia, and ordered to be printed.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. LYBRAND, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R.

5288) relating to lights on steam pilot vessels, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 197); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINNEY, from the Committee on Elections No. 1, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 130) relating to contested-election case of Evans vs. Turner, Fifth Congressional district of Kentucky, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 198); which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. ROBERTS, from the Committee on Elections No. 3, to which was referred the resolution of the House (H. Res. 131) relating to the contested-election case of Pearson vs. Crawford, from the Ninth Congressional district of North Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 199); which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRANTLEY: A bill (H. R. 8059) to amend the items in the river and harbor acts of 1894, 1896, and 1899, containing the contract with C. P. Goodyear, his heirs and assigns, to deepen the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8060) to establish a military post at or near Waycross, Ga.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 8061) to incorporate the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FLYNN: A bill (H. R. 8062) creating the county of Quapaw, Okla., and defining the boundaries thereof—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8063) to legalize and maintain the iron bridge across Pearl River at Rockport, Miss.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 8064) in relation to the suppression of insurrection in, and to the government of, the Philippine Islands, ceded by Spain to the United States by the treaty concluded at Paris on the 10th day of December, 1898—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 8065) permitting citizens of the United States, bona fide residents of the States of California, Oregon, and Washington, to fell and remove, for building, agricultural, mining, and other domestic purposes, timber growing or being upon the mineral lands of the United States in the States aforesaid—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 8066) for the preservation of prehistoric monuments, ruins, and objects, and to prevent their counterfeiting—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CRUMPACKER: A bill (H. R. 8067) to incorporate the National Society United States Daughters Eighteen Hundred and Twelve—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: A bill (H. R. 8068) authorizing the board of supervisors of Pima County, Arizona Territory, to issue fifty-year 5 per cent bonds of Pima County, Arizona Territory, to redeem certain funded indebtedness of said county—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 8069) to amend an act approved July 22, 1892, entitled "An act to provide for the opening of alleys in the District of Columbia"—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JOY (by request): A bill (H. R. 8070) to require employees of the United States and District governments in the District of Columbia to pay certain judgment debts or be dismissed from service—to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8071) providing that calls made by the Court of Claims under the provision of section 1076 of the Revised Statutes shall be complied with in ten days—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 8072) for the preparation of a site and erection of a pedestal for statue of late Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. KERR: A bill (H. R. 8073) to provide for lessening the number of appeals in applications for patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. SMALL: A bill (H. R. 8123) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to make a preliminary examination and survey of Pasquotank River, North Carolina, at a point known as South Mills, through the said river and cut to Albemarle Sound, through Albemarle Sound to Croatan Sound, through Croatan Sound to Pamlico Sound, through Pamlico Sound to Core Sound, through Core Sound to Beaufort Inlet, including a survey of said inlet, with the cost of establishing permanently a draft of water of not less than 18 feet over said Beaufort Inlet Bar at low water—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 158) directing the Secretary of War to submit plans and estimates for the construction of a breakwater at Luces Landing, Northville, Suffolk County, N. Y.—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 159) to amend joint resolution to furnish the daily Congressional Record to members of the press, and so forth, approved February 17, 1897—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BROWNLOW: A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 160) providing for the publication of 200,000 copies of the Special Report on the Diseases of Sheep—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A resolution (H. Res. 127) requiring the Commissioner of Pensions to make special report—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POWERS: A resolution (H. Res. 128) providing an amendment to the rules—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A resolution (H. Res. 129) of inquiry relating to certain contracts in the Navy Department—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LOUDENSLAGER: A resolution (H. Res. 132) providing for an annual clerk for the Committee on Pensions—to the Committee on Accounts.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 8074) for the relief of Wormley E. Wrae, Hawesville, Hancock County, Ky.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARHAM: A bill (H. R. 8075) removing the charge of desertion from the record of Samuel Watson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8076) for the relief of W. S. Curless, of California—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8077) removing the charge of desertion from the record of John Hill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BURKETT: A bill (H. R. 8078) granting a pension to G. W. Fairbrother—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURLEIGH: A bill (H. R. 8079) granting a pension to Bertha M. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 8080) granting a pension to Mrs. Eley Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDDY: A bill (H. R. 8081) granting a pension to Caroline Oliver, widow of Edward E. Oliver, private, Company A, Captain Parker's Iowa Dragoons Volunteers, Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of New York (by request): A bill (H. R. 8082) to pay John Pope Hodnett for services rendered as counsel to the Government in the investigation into affairs of the District of Columbia, acting as such counsel by order of a resolution of the House of Representatives; also for acting as counsel for the workmen of the District of Columbia for fifteen years last past—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 8083) granting an increase of pension to James Winnie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 8084) removing the charges of desertion from the military record of Myron H. McMullen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8085) restoring to the pension roll Alexander D. Harper, alias John Harden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 8086) for the relief of the First Presbyterian Church, of Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HENRY of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8087) for the relief of the estate of Richard Harding, deceased, late of Claiborne County, Miss.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 8088) for the relief of the legal representatives of Margaret A. Russell, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 8089) granting a pension to Catherine Pixley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8090) granting a pension to the minor heirs of Patrick McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LENTZ: A bill (H. R. 8091) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Styles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8092) to increase pension of Silas Barnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINNEY: A bill (H. R. 8093) for the relief of D. Froneberger, surviving partner of the firm of D. Froneberger & Co., late of Cleveland County, N. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCLELLAN: A bill (H. R. 8094) authorizing the restoration of the name of Nathan S. Jarvis, late captain and

assistant surgeon, United States Army, to the rolls of the Army, and providing that he be placed on the list of retired officers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 8095) to correct the military record of William M. Sibel, alias William Siple—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): A bill (H. R. 8096) for the relief of Thomas Sherman, of Culpeper County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8097) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Samuel W. Hough, administrator of William N. Hough, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8098) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Duncan James—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDELL: A bill (H. R. 8099) for the relief of Stephen D. Clark and the estate of Emma C. Lovelace, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RAY of New York: A bill (H. R. 8100) granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: A bill (H. R. 8101) for the relief of the estate of Cyrus Martin, deceased, late of Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: A bill (H. R. 8102) for the relief of Edward Everett Hayden, United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 8103) for the relief of Augusta De Ahna—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8104) granting to the grandson, heir and representative, of Maj. John Burnham a sum of money equal to the amount of pension withheld from him between March 4, 1820, and February 7, 1828—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: A bill (H. R. 8105) for the relief of A. G. White, postmaster at Beaver, Pa.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8106) granting a pension to Olivia Donath—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8107) granting a pension to Nancy W. Hadley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8108) for the relief of Philip Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8109) for the relief of Anthony Remley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8110) granting relief to Milo Osterhout—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Kentucky (by request): A bill (H. R. 8111) for the relief of Caroline Commandun, widow of Eugene Commandun, adjutant of the Twenty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCUDDER: A bill (H. R. 8112) granting a pension to John Vogler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 8113) for the relief of Recknagel & Co.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 8114) granting a pension to Annie E. Bell and Florence M. Bell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WATERS: A bill (H. R. 8115) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Robert Fairman—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMS of Mississippi: A bill (H. R. 8116) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of J. B. McAlpin, administrator of John Willis, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOVENER: A bill (H. R. 8117) to grant Amelia Hutchinson an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McALEER: A bill (H. R. 8118) to remove the charge of desertion now standing against George Brownlay, or Brownlee, late of Company A, Sixty-ninth New York Infantry Volunteers, and grant him an honorable discharge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROBERTS: A bill (H. R. 8119) granting a pension to Michael Murphy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 8120) granting an increase of pension to David L. Wentworth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 8121) granting a pension to Sarah Kate Tibbs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH: A bill (H. R. 8122) for the relief of Frank B. Crosthwaite—to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Resolutions of the National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the passage of House bill No. 887, for the promotion of exhibits in the Philadelphia museums—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.



Also, resolution of the National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the laying of competing cable lines to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. ALLEN of Kentucky: Papers to accompany House bill to correct the military record of W. E. Wroe—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BOUTELLE of Maine: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Portland, Me., asking for an appropriation for the erection of a United States court building in the city of Portland, Me.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. BRANTLEY: Resolutions of the mayors and councils of Lumber City and Waycross, Ga., indorsing the work of C. P. Goodyear on the outer bar of Brunswick, Ga., and urging such legislation as will enable him to continue the work—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BURKEIT: Resolutions of the National Board of Trade, of Philadelphia, Pa., in favor of the laying of competing cable lines to Cuba—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Mrs. Elcy Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of W. B. Koon and other citizens of Onarga, Ill., protesting against certain postal legislation—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CHICKERING: Petition of underwriters of Oswego, N. Y., favoring amendment to the revenue law in regard to affixing stamps on insurance policies—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COONEY: Resolutions adopted by the employees in the Bureau of Animal Industry stationed at Louisville, Ky., and Kansas City, Mo., for provision to grant them the usual leave of absence with pay—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COWHERD: Resolution of the common council of Kansas City, Mo., favoring the passage of House bill No. 4351, for the reclassification of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Kansas City branch of the National Association of Railway Postal Clerks, favoring a bill providing for the reclassification of the Railway Mail Service—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CUSACK: Petition of Henry F. Boynton and other citizens of the Fourth Congressional district of Illinois, asking for the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DALZELL: Memorial of the Appalachian National Park Association, asking for legislation for examination and surveys to determine the best location for a proposed national park in the southern Appalachian region—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of the National Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring a competing submarine cable line between Cuba and the United States—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. EDDY: Resolutions adopted by the Minneapolis (Minn.) Board of Trade, in favor of a more efficient harbor between the South Pass of the Mississippi and the Gulf of Mexico—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, resolutions adopted by the Minneapolis (Minn.) Chamber of Commerce and John A. Logan Regiment, No. 2, Union Veterans' Union, of St. Paul, Minn., protesting against the passage of House bill No. 3988—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GAMBLE: Paper to accompany House bill No. 7074, for the relief of Michael Ackerman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GLYNN: Paper to accompany House bill No. 6795, for the relief of Daniel Leary—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania: Statement of the Mellert Foundry and Machine Company, of Reading, Pa., to accompany House bill No. 4413, in relation to a Government contract—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of Thomas W. Cook and others, of New Bedford, Mass., in favor of House bill No. 4742, for military instruction in the public schools—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Rev. J. H. Reid and 19 other citizens of Bellows Falls, Vt., for the passage of House bill No. 1144, relating to the prevention of cruelty to animals in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HOPKINS: Resolutions of the Cigar Makers' International Union of America, Local Union No. 71, Elgin, Ill., in relation to the reclamation and settlement of public land—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KLUTTZ: Memorial of the Appalachian National Park Association, in favor of legislation for examination and surveys to determine the best location for a proposed national park in the southern Appalachian region—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolution of the millers of the State of Iowa,

in favor of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, resolution of Local Union No. 172, of Foster, Iowa, United Mine Workers of America, favoring trial by jury in injunction contempt cases—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANE: Remonstrance of J. Lohmann and others, of Wheatland, Iowa, against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LENTZ: Papers to accompany House bill granting a pension to Silas Barnett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Isaac N. Hays, guardian, for pension to minors of Patrick McGee—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Letter of Maj. R. H. Ferguson, of Chicago, Ill., urging the construction of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Henry S. Robbins and other members of the bar of the Supreme Court of the United States, asking for better quarters for the law library of Congress—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MERCER: Remonstrance of citizens of Blair, Nebr., against the parcels-post bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NEVILLE: Evidence and papers to accompany House bill No. 6523, granting a pension to Joseph W. Skelton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OTJEN: Resolution of the common council of the city of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of the naval training school—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. PAYNE: Petition of Austin Thomas and others, of South McAlester, Ind. T., for free transportation to citizens of African blood who desire to locate in Liberia, Africa, or in the Philippine Islands, with suitable homestead provision—to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. POWERS: Petition of Ohio Wool Growers' Association, Columbus, Ohio, against the ratification of the treaty with the Argentine Republic—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Good Templars of Vermont, praying for more stringent legislation against the sale of liquors in the Army canteens—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 5938, granting a pension to Mary M. Strong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAY of New York: Papers to accompany House bill to increase the pension of Julia A. Cook—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIXEY (by request): Petition of Agnes B. Hoffman, to accompany House bill granting her a pension of \$12 per month from January 1, 1898—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUCKER: Petition of 78 citizens of Oklahoma Territory, praying for the passage of a free-home bill—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Resolutions of secretaries and officers of Connecticut associations of civil-war veterans, favoring service pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: Petitions of the publishers of the Rawlins (Wyo.) Herald; Kewanee Star-Courier; Trion Factory Herald, Georgia; Harlem Reporter, New York; Howard Democrat, South Dakota; The State, Columbia, S. C.; Union Scout, Dalles Times-Mountaineer, Oregon; Easton Star-Democrat, Maryland; Wyndham Journal, Catskill Recorder, Warsaw Times, Nyack City and Country, Rome Sentinel, New Rochelle Press, Cooperstown Journal, Canandaigua Repository-Messenger, Cobleskill Index, Genesee Democrat, Watkins Democrat, Carthage Tribune, Rochester Herald, Callicoon Democrat, White Plains State Journal, in the State of New York; also the Raleigh News and Observer, Washington Progress, Newbern Journal, Lenoir Topic, Kinston Free Press, Hendersonville Hustler, Greenville Weekly, Goldsboro Headlight, Concord Times, Winston Sentinel, Asheville Citizen, Oxford Public Ledger, in the State of North Carolina; also Edwardsville Standard-News, Huntsville Mercury, Mobile News, Clanton Banner, Oneonta News-Dispatch, Florence Herald, Ashland Advocate, Montgomery Advertiser, Gurley Herald, Tuskegee News, in the State of Alabama; Hudson Gazette, Jackson Star, Howell Democrat, Holland Times, Reed City Democrat, Hillsdale Democrat, Jackson Patriot, Grand Rapids Democrat, Hastings Journal, Big Rapids Herald and Bulletin, Grand Rapids Chronicle, Mount Clemens Press, Charlotte Leader, Charlevoix Courier, Newago Democrat, Owosso Reporter, Three Rivers Tribune, Pontiac Gazette, Hastings Herald, in the State of Michigan; also Lawrenceville (Pa.) Herald; also Magnolia Banner, Corning Courier, Fort Smith Elevator, Pine Bluff Graphic, Batesville Bee, Pine Bluff Eagle, Bentonville Sun, Ozark Democrat, Conway Democrat, Waldron Reporter, in the State of Arkansas; also New London Record, Perry Enterprise, Sedalia Sentinel, Clinton Tribune, Marceline Mirror, Gallatin Democrat, Columbia Statesman, Alton Missionary, Cassville Democrat, Nevada Post, Springfield Leader-Democrat, Warrensburg Star,

Canton Press, Ava Farm Record, Keytesville Signal, Houston Herald, Waynesville Democrat, Carrollton Democrat, Carthage Democrat, Sturgeon Leader, Shelbyville Herald, Fulton Sun, Monroe City Democrat, Kirksville Democrat, Shelby Democrat, Troy Free Press, Clayton Argus, Marshall Democrat-News, Excelsior Springs Standard, Joplin Globe, in the State of Missouri, for the repeal of the tariff on printing paper—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHOWALTER: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of A. G. White—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of James T. Donovan and other clerks in the post-office at Milford, Mass., in favor of the passage of House bill No. 4351—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: Resolutions of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, in favor of establishing a Government route to the Philippines via Puget Sound—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of John A. Logan Regiment, No. 2, Union Veterans' Union, of St. Paul, Minn., in opposition to House bill No. 3988, relating to appointments in the Weather Bureau—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, resolution of the St. Paul Chamber of Commerce, against provisions of the Payne-Hanna ship-subsidy bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## SENATE.

TUESDAY, February 6, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on motion of Mr. ALLEN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal, without objection, will stand approved.

### IRRIGATION ON THE GILA RIVER, ARIZONA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 29th ultimo, a letter from the Director of the Geological Survey inclosing a report on the general conditions and cost of water storage for irrigation on the Gila River, Arizona, for the benefit of the Indians occupying the Gila River Reservation; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on the Geological Survey, and ordered to be printed.

### THE FINANCIAL BILL.

Mr. BATE. Mr. President, I shall ask permission to address the Senate to-morrow at 2 o'clock upon the unfinished business, the financial bill.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2727) authorizing payment of commutation of rations to the petty officers of the Navy who served on detached duty between March 1, 1898, and November 4, 1899.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 6493) for the relief of John Anderson, a Pottawatomie Indian, and his adult children; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PLATT of New York presented a petition of the New York Railroad Club, praying that the International Railway Congress of 1904 be held in the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Cigar Makers' Union of Oneonta, N. Y., praying that all the remaining public lands of the United States should be sacredly held for the benefit of the whole people and that no grants to the title of these lands should ever be made to any but actual settlers; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Holley, N. Y., and a petition of sundry citizens of Rhinebeck, N. Y., praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of Edmund Wetmore and sundry other lawyers of New York City, praying that better facilities be provided for the law library of Congress; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PERKINS. I present a memorial of the legislature of California, remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called reciprocity treaty between this country and the British West India Islands, known as the Jamaica treaty. I ask that the memorial be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE CAPITOL, Sacramento, Cal., February 5, 1900.

Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS,

United States Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

In accordance with the instructions sent forth in the accompanying joint resolution, I herewith transmit same and certify to its correctness:

Senate joint resolution No. 5, introduced by Senator Jones February 3, 1900. Read and adopted February 5, 1900. Senate joint resolution No. 5, relative to a so-called reciprocity treaty between this country and the British West India Islands, known as the Jamaica treaty.

Whereas there is now pending in the Senate of the United States, for ratification, a so-called reciprocity treaty between this country and the British West India Islands, known as the Jamaica treaty; and

Whereas the proposed reduction of duties upon the importations from these islands that come into competition with the products of the United States apply only to sugar-cane products, citrus fruits, and fresh vegetables, which are only produced in competing quantities by the States of Florida, Louisiana, and California; and

Whereas the articles of export enumerated in said proposed treaty upon which a reduction of duty is obtained are neither produced nor exported from cities of the said States of Florida, Louisiana, or California, thereby entailing great loss to them without any corresponding benefits; and

Whereas the citrus products of this State, amounting to over 5,000,000 boxes, which will be doubled within the next decade, is handicapped by a freight rate to the principal centers of population and trade of 90 cents per box, which exceeds by 15 cents per box the combined freight rate and the proposed import duty from the British West Indies; and

Whereas the citrus products of these islands come directly into competition with the holiday trade, which is known to be the best of the entire year; and Whereas the entire imports of the island of Jamaica have never exceeded \$8,000,000 dollars per annum, a large proportion of which is imported from England owing to a preferential tariff rate; and

Whereas, at the request of this body and the petition of the citrus fruit-growers of this State, the Fifty-fifth Congress fixed a tariff duty upon that product, placing it on an equality with the foreign production in respect to the freight rate only; and

Whereas the American producer is entitled to and ought by right to enjoy the benefit of his home market when fully able to supply the demand: Therefore,

*Resolved by the senate of the State of California, the assembly jointly,* That it deprecates the attempt to disturb the present existing conditions of the tariff upon sugar, citrus fruits, and fresh vegetables; that it is an unequal and unjust hardship to sacrifice the interests of a few for the benefit of a very large majority; that the supposed benefits accruing to this country in its added proportion of the \$8,000,000 of trade with Jamaica will not compensate it for the loss inflicted upon one item alone of California production; that the California producer is entitled to a protective duty as against foreign competition at least equal to the difference in their several freight rates, and that the American producer should be maintained in his demand for the market of his own country; and be it

*Further resolved,* That our Senators be instructed to vote against the ratification of said treaty, and that our Representatives in Congress be requested to use their influence and best efforts to accomplish its defeat.

*Resolved,* That a copy of these resolutions be telegraphed to the Hon. GEORGE C. PERKINS by the secretary of senate, and that a copy be transmitted by mail to each of our Representatives in Washington.

F. J. BRANDON,

Secretary of Senate.

Mr. ROSS presented the petition of Selim Newell and sundry other railway mail clerks of St. Johnsbury, Vt., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. LODGE presented sundry petitions of railway mail clerks of Newton Centre and North Attleboro, in the State of Massachusetts, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Leominster, Mass., praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. ALLEN presented a petition of sundry railway clerks of Beatrice, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented the petition of Dr. R. S. Grimes and sundry other citizens of Nebraska, praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of William H. Dodge, D. V. S., and 102 other citizens of Leominster, Mass., praying for the establishment of an Army veterinary corps; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of South Framingham, Mass., and a petition of sundry railway mail clerks of Lowell, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide for the classification of clerks in first and second class post-offices; which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented a petition of sundry letter carriers of Lowell, Mass., praying for the passage of House bill No. 1051, to regulate the pay of substitute letter carriers; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DANIEL presented a petition of the Business Men's Association of Newport News, Va., praying that an appropriation be made to continue the work of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.